

Islamic Dynasties of Central, East, and South Asia

By

Clifford Edmund Bosworth

from

*New Islamic Dynasties
A Chronological and Genealogical Manual*

(Edinburgh, 1996)

1. The Caliphs

10. The Eastern Persian Lands, Transoxania and Khwarazm before the Seljuqs

13. The Mongols and their Central Asian and Eastern European Successors

14. Persia after the Mongols

15. Central Asia after the Mongols

16. Afghanistan and the Indian Subcontinent

17. South-East Asia and Indonesia

[Writings by C. E. Bosworth](#) at Internet Archive.

This material is presented solely for non-commercial educational/research purposes.

CONTENTS

Abbreviations used	xiv
Introduction	xv
CHAPTER ONE The Caliphs	
1. The Rightly-Guided or 'Patriarchal' or 'Orthodox' Caliphs (<i>al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidūn</i>)	1
2. The Umayyad Caliphs	3
1. The Sufyānids	
2. The Marwānids	
3. The 'Abbāsīd Caliphs	6
1. The caliphs in Iraq and Baghdad	
2. The caliph in Aleppo, Harrān and northern Syria	
3. The caliphs in Cairo	
CHAPTER TWO Spain	
4. The Spanish Umayyads	11
5. The Mulūk al-Ṭawā'if or Reyes de Taifas in Spain	14
1. The Hammūdids of Málaga	
2. The Hammūdids of Ceuta	
3. The 'Abbadids of Seville	
4. The Banū Birzāl in Carmona	
5. The Banū Khazrūn in Arcos	
6. The Zīrids of Granada	
7. The Banū Ṣumādih of Almería	
8. The Banū Mujāhid of Denia and Majorca	
9. The rulers in Majorca during the eleventh and early twelfth centuries	
10. The Jahwarids of Cordova	
11. The rulers in Cordova of the Almoravid-Almohad interregnum	
12. The Aftasids of Badajoz	
13. The Dhu 'l-Nūnids of Toledo	
14. The 'Āmirids of Valencia	
15. The rulers in Valencia of the Almoravid-Almohad interregnum	
16. The Tujibids in Saragossa	
17. The Hūdids in Saragossa, Huesca, Tudela and Lérida, and, subsequently, Denia, Tortosa and Calatayud	
18. The rulers of Murcia, including the Ṭāhirids and Hūdids	
6. The Banū Ghāniya	21
7. The Naṣrids or Banu 'l-Aḥmar	22
CHAPTER THREE North Africa	
8. The Idrīsids	25
9. The Rustamids	27
10. The Midrārids	29
11. The Aghlabids	31

CONTENTS

12. The Kalbids	33
13. The Zīrids and Hammādids	35
14. The Almoravids or al-Murābiṭūn	37
15. The Almohads or al-Muwahḥidūn	39
16. The Marīnids	41
17. The 'Abd al-Wādids or Zayyānids or Ziyānids	43
18. The Ḥafṣids	45
19. The Wattāsids	48
20. The Sa'did Sharifs	50
21. The 'Alawid or Filālī Sharifs	53
22. The Ḥusaynid Beys	55
23. The Qaramānlīs	57
24. The Sanūsī Chiefs and Rulers	58

CHAPTER FOUR Egypt and Syria

25. The Ṭulūnids	60
26. The Ikhshidids	62
27. The Faṭimids	63
28. The Mirdāsids	66
29. The chief <i>dā'īs</i> of the Nizārī Ismā'ilīs or Assassins in Syria	68
30. The Ayyūbids	70
1. The line in Egypt	
2. The line in Damascus	
3. The line in Aleppo	
4. The line in Ḥimṣ	
5. The line in Ḥamāt	
6. The line in Diyār Bakr (Mayyāfāriqīn and Jabal Sinjār)	
7. The line in Diyār Bakr (Ḥiṣn Kayfā, Āmid and Akhlāt)	
8. The line in Yemen	
9. The minor branches of the family in Ba'lbakk, Karak, Bāniyās and Subayba, and Buṣrā	
31. The Mamlūks	76
1. The Baḥrī line	
2. The Burjī line	
32. The Ma'n Amīrs of Lebanon	81
33. The Shihāb Amīrs of Lebanon	82
34. The house of Muḥammad 'Alī	83

CHAPTER FIVE Iraq and Jazīra before the Seljuqs

35. The Ḥamdānids	85
1. The line in Mosul and Jazīra	
2. The line in Aleppo and northern Syria	
36. The Mazyadids	87
37. The Marwānids	89
38. The 'Uqaylids	91
1. The line in Jazīrat Ibn 'Umar, Niṣībīn and Balad of Muḥammad b. al-Musayyab al-'Uqaylī	
2. The line in Mosul and later in Jazīrat Ibn 'Umar, Niṣībīn and	

Balad, also of the al-Musayyab line	
3. The line in Takrīt of Ma'n b. al-Muqallad's descendants	
4. The line in Hīt	
5. The line in 'Ukbarā of Ma'n b. al-Muqallad's descendants	
6. The other minor branches at Āna and al-Haditha and at Qal'at Ja'bar	
39. The Numayrids	93
CHAPTER SIX The Arabian Peninsula	
40. The Carmathian or Qarmaṭī Rulers of the line of Abū Sa'id al-Jannābī	94
41. The Zaydī Imāms of Yemen	96
1. The early period: the Rassid line	
2. The more recent period: the Qāsimid line	
42. The Ziyādids	99
43. The Yu'firids or Ya'furids	100
44. The Najāhids	101
45. The Sulayhids	102
46. The Zuray'ids or Banu 'l-Karam	104
47. The Hamdānids	106
1. The first line of the Banū Ḥatīm	
2. The line of the Banu 'l-Qubayb	
3. The second line of the Banū Ḥatīm	
48. The Mahdids	107
49. The Rasūlids	108
50. The Ṭahirids	110
51. The Āl al-Julandā	111
52. The Mukramids	112
53. The Ya'rubids	113
54. The Āl Bū Sa'id	114
1. The united sultanate	
2. The line of sultans in Oman	
3. The line of sultans in Zanzibar	
55. The Āl Su'ūd (Sa'ūd)	116
56. The Ḥashimite Sharīfs of Mecca from the 'Awn family	118
1. The original line in Western Arabia	
2. The post-First World War branches of the Ḥashimite family in the Fertile Crescent countries	
(a) The line in Syria	
(b) The line in Iraq	
(c) The line in Transjordan and then Jordan	
57. The Āl Rashīd	120
CHAPTER SEVEN West Africa	
58. The Keita Kings of Mali	122
59. The Kings of Songhay	124
1. The Zas or Zuwas of Gao	
2. The Sis or Sonnis	
3. The Askīyas	

60. The Rulers of Kanem and Bornu or Borno	126
1. The 'red' (i.e. white) Sayfī (Sefuwa) or Yazanī rulers of Kanem	
2. The 'black' Sultans of Kanem	
3. The new line of Sultans in Bornu, the Mais or rulers, claiming Sayfī descent	
4. The Kanembu line of Shaykhs or Shehus of Bornu and Dikwa	
(a) The Shehus in Bornu, reinstated by the British	
(b) The Shehus and Mais in Dikwa, reinstated by the French	
61. The Fulani Rulers in Hausaland, as Sultans and Caliphs of Sokoto	130
CHAPTER EIGHT East Africa and the Horn of Africa	
62. The Sultans of Kilwa	132
1. The Shīrāzī dynasty	
2. The Mahdali Sayyids	
63. The Nabhānī Rulers of Pate	134
64. The Mazrui (Mazrū'i) <i>Liwalis</i> or Governors of Mombasa	136
65. The Āl Bū Sa'īd in East Africa	137
66. The Sultans of Harar	138
1. The line of Aḥmad Grāñ in Harar and AUSA	
2. The line of 'Alī b. Dāwūd in Harar, independent of AUSA	
CHAPTER NINE The Caucasus and the Western Persian Lands before the Seljuqs	
67. The Sharwān Shāhs	140
1. The first line of Yazīdī Shāhs	
2. The second line of Shāhs	
68. The Hāshimids	143
69. The Justānids	145
70. The Sājids	147
71. The Musāfirids or Sallārīds	148
1. The line in Azerbaijan	
2. The line in Daylam	
72. The Rawwādids	150
73. The Shaddādids	151
1. The main line in Ganja and Dvīn	
2. The line in Ānī	
74. The Dulafids	153
75. The Būyids or Buwayhids	154
1. The line in Jibāl	
(a) The branch in Hamadan and Isfahan	
(b) The branch in Rayy	
2. The line in Fars (Fārs) and Khūzistān	
3. The line in Kirman (Kirmān)	
4. The line in Iraq	
5. The rulers of the dynasty acknowledged by local chiefs in Oman	
76. The Ḥasanūyids or Ḥasanawayhids	158
77. The 'Annāzids	159

78. The Kākūyids or Kākawayhids	160
79. The Dābūyid Ispahbadhs	162
80. The Bāwandid Ispahbadhs	164
1. The line of the Kāwūsiyya (Ṭabaristān), with their centre at Firrīm	
2. The line of the Ispahbadhiyya (Ṭabaristān and Gīlān), with their centre at Sārī	
3. The line of the Kīnkhwāriyya (vassals of the Il Khānids), with their centre at Āmul	
81. The Ziyārids	166

CHAPTER TEN The Eastern Persian Lands, Transoxania and Khwārazm before the Seljuqs

82. The Ṭāhirids and Muṣʿabids	168
1. The governors in Khurasan and its administrative dependencies	
2. The military governors (<i>Aṣḥāb al-Shurṭa</i>) in Baghdad and Iraq	
83. The Sāmānids	170
84. The Ṣaffārids	172
1. The Laythid branch	
2. The Khalafid branch	
85. The Bānījūrīds or Abū Dāwūdīds	174
86. The Sīmījūrīds	175
87. The Ilyāsīds	176
88. The Muḥtājīds	177
89. The Khwārazm Shāhs	178
1. The Afrīghīds of Kāth	
2. The Maʾmūnīds of Gurgānj	
3. The Ghaznawīd governors with the title of Khwārazm Shāh	
4. The line of Anūshtigin Shihna, originally as governors for the Seljuqs with the title of Khwārazm Shāh, from towards the mid-twelfth century often in practice largely independent rulers in Khwārazm and, at times, in Transoxania and Persia	
90. The Qarakhānīds	181
1. The Great Qaghans of the united kingdom	
2. The Great Qaghans of the western kingdom (Transoxania, including Bukhara and Samarkand, and Farghāna at times), with its centre at Samarkand	
3. The Great Qaghans of the eastern kingdom (Īlāq, Talas, Shāsh, at times Farghāna, Semirechye, Kāshghar and Khotan), with its centre at Balāsāghūn, later Kāshghar	
4. The Qaghans in Farghāna, with their centre in Uzgend	

CHAPTER ELEVEN The Seljuqs, Their Dependants and the Atabegs

91. The Seljuqs	185
1. The Great Seljuqs in Persia and Iraq	
2. The Seljuqs of Syria	
3. The Seljuqs of Kirman	
92. The Bōrīds or Būrīds	189

93. The Zangids	190
1. The main line in Mosul and Aleppo	
2. The line in Damascus and then Aleppo	
3. The line in Sinjār	
4. The line in Jazīra	
5. The line in Shahrazūr	
94. The Begtiginids	192
95. The Lu'lu'ids	193
96. The Artuqids	194
1. The line in Ḥiṣn Kayfā and Āmid	
2. The line in Khartpert	
3. The line in Mārdīn and Mayyāfāriqīn	
97. The Shāh-i Armanids	197
1. The Sökmenids	
2. The Sökmenid slave commanders	
98. The Aḥmadīlis	198
99. The Eldigüzids or Ildegizids	199
100. The Bādūspānids	201
1. The rulers of the united principality	
2. The rulers in Kujūr (with the title of Malik)	
3. The rulers in Nūr (with the title of Malik)	
101. The Nizārī Ismā'īlis or Assassins in Persia	203
102. The Hazāraspids	205
103. The Salghurids	207
104. The Atabegs of Yazd	209
105. The Qutlughkhānids	210
106. The Maliks of Nīmruz	211
1. The Naṣrids	
2. The Mihrabānids	
CHAPTER TWELVE The Turks in Anatolia	
107. The Seljuqs of Rūm	213
108. The Dānishmendids	215
1. The line in Sivas	
2. The line in Malatya and Elbistan	
109. The Mengüjekids	217
1. The line in Erzincan and Kemakh	
2. The line in Divriği	
110. The Saltuqids	218
111. The Qarasī (Karasī) Oghullarī	219
112. The Sarukhān Oghullarī	220
113. The Aydın Oghullarī	221
114. The Menteshē Oghullarī	222
115. The Inanj Oghullarī	223
116. The Germiyān Oghullarī	224
117. The Şāhib Atā Oghullarī	225
118. The Ḥamīd Oghullarī and the Tekke Oghullarī	226
1. The Ḥamīd Oghullarī line in Eğridir	

2. The Tekke Oghullarī line in Antalya	
119. The Beys of Alanya	227
120. The Ashraf (Eshref) Oghullarī	228
121. The Jāndār Oghullarī or Isfandiyār (Isfendiyār) Oghullarī	229
122. The Parwāna Oghullarī	230
123. The Chobān Oghullarī	231
124. The Qaramān Oghullarī or Qaramānids	232
125. The Eretna Oghullarī	234
126. The Qāḍī Burhān al-Dīn Oghullarī	235
127. The Tāj al-Dīn Oghullarī	236
128. The Ramaḍān Oghullarī	237
129. The Dulghadīr Oghullarī or Dhu 'l-Qadrids	238
130. The Ottomans or Osmanlis	239

CHAPTER THIRTEEN The Mongols and their Central Asian and Eastern European Successors

The Mongols or Chingizids	243
131. The Mongol Great Khāns, Descendants of Ögedey and Toluy, later the Yüan Dynasty of China	246
132. The Chaghatayids, Descendants of Chaghatay	248
133. The Il Khānids, Descendants of Qubilay's brother Hülegü	250
134. The Khāns of the Golden Horde, Descendants of Jochi	252
1. The line of Batu'ids, Khāns of the Blue Horde in South Russia, Khwārazm and the western part of the Qipchaq steppe	
2. The line of Orda, Khāns of the White Horde in western Siberia and the eastern part of the Qipchaq steppe, and, after 780/1378, of the Blue and White Hordes united into the Golden Horde of South Russia	
135. The Giray Khāns of the Crimea, Descendants of Jochi	255
1. The Khāns of the Crimea	
2. The Khāns of the Tatars of Bujaq or Bessarabia, as Ottoman nominees	
136. The Khāns of Astrakhan (Astrakhān, Ashtarkhān)	258
137. The Khāns of Kazan (Qāzān)	259
1. The line of Ulugh Muḥammad	
2. Khāns from various outside lines	
138. The Khāns of Qāsimov	261
1. The Khāns from the line of rulers of Kazan	
2. The Khāns from the line of the rulers of the Crimea	
3. The Khāns from the line of the rulers of Astrakhan	
4. Kazakh Khān	
5. The Khāns from the line of the rulers of Siberia	

CHAPTER FOURTEEN Persia after the Mongols

139. The Karts or Kurts	263
140. The Muzaffarids	264
141. The Inju'ids	266
142. The Jalāyirids	267

CONTENTS

143. The Sarbadārids	269
144. The Timūrids	270
1. The rulers in Samarkand	
2. The rulers in Khurasan after Ulugh Beg's death	
3. The rulers in western Persia and Iraq after Tīmūr	
145. The Qara Qoyunlu	273
146. The Aq Qoyunlu	275
147. The Musha'sha'ids	277
148. The Ṣafawids	279
149. The Afshārids	281
150. The Zands	283
151. The Qājārs	285
152. The Pahlawīs	287

CHAPTER FIFTEEN Central Asia after the Mongols

153. The Shībānids (Shaybānids) or Abu 'l-Khayrids	288
154. The Toqay Temūrids or Jānids or Ashtarkhānids	290
155. The Mangīts	292
156. The Qungrats or Inaqids	293
157. The Mings	295

CHAPTER SIXTEEN Afghanistan and the Indian Subcontinent

158. The Ghaznawids	296
159. The Ghūrids	298
1. The main line in Ghūr and then also in Ghazna	
2. The line in Bāmiyān, Tukhāristān and Badakhshān	
160. The Delhi Sultans	300
1. The Mu'izzī or Shamsī Slave Kings	
2. The Khaljīs	
3. The Tughluqids	
4. The Sayyids	
5. The Lōdis	
6. The Sūrīs	
161. The Governors and Sultans of Bengal	306
1. The governors for the Delhi Sultans, often ruling as independent sovereigns	
2. The governors, and then independent rulers, of Balban's line	
3. The line of Ilyās Shāh	
4. The line of Rājā Gaṇeśa (Ganesh)	
5. The line of Ilyās Shāh restored	
6. The domination of the Ḥabashīs	
7. The line of Sayyid Ḥusayn Shāh	
8. The Sūrīs	
9. The Kararānis	
162. The Sultans of Kashmīr	310
1. The line of Shāh Mīr Swātī	
2. The line of Ghāzī Shāh Chak	
163. The Sultans of Gujarāt	312

CONTENTS

164. The Sharqī Sultans of Jawnpur	314
165. The Sultans and Rulers of Malwa	316
1. The line of the Ghūris	
2. The line of the Khaljis	
3. Various governors and independent rulers	
166. The Sultans of Ma'bar or Madura	318
167. The Bahmanids	319
1. The rulers at Ahsanābād-Gulbargā	
2. The rulers in Muḥammadābād-Bīdar	
168. The Fārūqī Rulers of Khāndesh	322
169. The Barīd Shāhis	324
170. The 'Adil Shāhis	325
171. The Nizām Shāhis	326
172. The 'Imād Shāhis	327
173. The Quṭb Shāhis	328
174. The Arghūns	329
1. The line of Dhu 'l-Nūn Beg	
2. The line of Muḥammad 'Isā Tarkhān	
175. The Mughal Emperors	331
176. The Nawwāb-Viziers and Nawwāb-Nāzims of Bengal	335
177. The Nawwāb-Viziers and Kings of Oudh (Awadh)	337
178. The Nāzims of Hyderabad (Haydarābād)	339
179. The Muslim Rulers in Mysore (Mahisur, Maysūr)	340
180. The Abdālī or Durrānī Rulers and Kings of Afghanistan	341
1. The Sadozays or Popalzays	
2. The Bārakzays or Muḥammadzays	
 CHAPTER SEVENTEEN South-East Asia and Indonesia	
181. The Rulers of Malacca (Melaka)	344
182. The Sultans of Aceh (Atjèh, Aceh)	346
183. The Rulers of Mataram	348
184. The Susuhunans of Surakarta	350
185. The Sultans of Jogjakarta	351
186. The Sultans of Brunei	353
Indexes: (a) Personal names; (b) Dynasties, peoples, tribes, etc. (c) Places	357

ABBREVIATIONS USED

Album	= Stephen Album, <i>A Checklist of Popular Islamic Coins</i> , Santa Rosa, CA 1993
AIEO <i>Alger</i>	= <i>Annales de l'Institut d'Etudes Orientales, Alger</i>
AMI	= <i>Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran</i>
ANS	= <i>The American Numismatic Society</i>
BIFAO	= <i>Bulletin de l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale du Caire</i>
Bosworth-Merçil-İpşirli	= C. E. Bosworth, tr. Erdoğan Merçil and Mehmet İpşirli, <i>İslâm devletleri tarihi (kronoloji ve soykütüğü elkitabı)</i> , Istanbul 1980
CT	= <i>Cahiers de Tunisie</i>
EI ¹	= <i>Encyclopaedia of Islam</i> , 1st edn, Leiden 1913–36
EI ²	= <i>Encyclopaedia of Islam</i> , 2nd edn, Leiden 1960–
EIR	= <i>Encyclopaedia Iranica</i> , London, etc. 1985–
HJAS	= <i>Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies</i>
İA	= <i>İslam Ansiklopedisi</i> , Istanbul 1940–85
IC	= <i>Islamic Culture</i>
<i>Iran</i> , JBIPS	= <i>Iran, Journal of the British Institute of Persian Studies</i>
JA	= <i>Journal Asiatique</i>
JAOS	= <i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
JASB	= <i>Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal</i>
JBRRAS	= <i>Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society</i>
JRAS	= <i>Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society</i>
Justi	= F. Justi, <i>Iranisches Namenbuch</i> , Marburg 1895
Khalil Ed'hem	= Khalil Ed'hem, <i>Düvel-i Islâmiyye</i> , Istanbul 1345/1927
Lane-Poole	= Stanley Lane-Poole, <i>The Mohammadan Dynasties. Chronological and Genealogical Tables with Historical Introductions</i> , London 1893
Méms DAFA	= <i>Mémoires de la Délégation Archéologique Française en Afghanistan</i>
NC	= <i>Numismatic Chronicle</i>
NZ	= <i>Numismatische Zeitschrift</i>
REI	= <i>Revue des Etudes Islamiques</i>
Sachau	= Eduard Sachau, 'Ein Verzeichnis Muhammedanischer Dynastien', <i>Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse</i> (Berlin 1923), no. 1
SAD	= <i>Selçuklu Araştırmalar Dergisi (Journal of Seljuk Studies)</i>
SBWAW	= <i>Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften, Phil.-hist. Klasse</i>
TP	= <i>T'oung-Pao</i>
Zambaur	= E. de Zambaur, <i>Manuel de généalogie et de chronologie pour l'histoire de l'Islam</i> , Hanover 1927
ZfN	= <i>Zeitschrift für Numismatik</i>

INTRODUCTION

The precursor of this present book, *The Islamic Dynasties: A Chronological and Genealogical Handbook*, was published by Edinburgh University Press in 1967 as no. 5 in the *Islamic Surveys* series, and speedily established itself as a convenient reference work for the chronology of Islamic dynasties of the Middle Eastern and North African heartlands and of Central and South Asia and for their historical backgrounds. It has proved useful not only for Islamic historians but also for Islamic art historians and numismatists. Nevertheless, all these groups of scholars remain much less well provided with such *Hilfsmittel* as chronologies of events, genealogical tables, historical atlases, etc., than their colleagues in the fields of British or European history.¹ Some of the subsequent writers of general histories of the Islamic world or its component regions and peoples, and writers of reference works covering the world in general or the Islamic lands in particular, who have given lists of dynasties and rulers, have obviously drawn upon the original *Islamic Dynasties* – sometimes with due acknowledgement,² sometimes not.

To my knowledge, four translations into East European and Middle Eastern languages have been made. In 1971, there appeared in Moscow an authorised translation by P. A. Gryaznevich, under the overall editorship of I. P. Petrushevskiy, *Musulmanskie dynastii. Spravochnik po khronologii i genealogii*, Izdatel'stvo <<Nauka>> Glavnaya Redaktsiya Vostochnoi Literaturi, 324 pp., to which I contributed a Preface. The text is a straight translation, but the bibliographical indications at the end of each dynasty's entry have been enriched by references to works in Russian, obviously valuable for such regions as the Caucasus, Central Asia and the Iranian world in general. In 1980, there appeared in Istanbul *İslâm devletleri tarihi (kronoloji ve soykütüğü elkitabı)*, Oğuz Press, xxvii + 385 pp., an authorised Turkish translation by Erdoğan Merçil and Mehmet İpşirli. This has additional material in that Dr Merçil appended an additional, eleventh chapter 'Anadolu beylikleri' dealing in detail with the principalities of Anatolia during the interim between the decay of the Rûm Seljuqs and the rise of the Ottomans. I have, in fact, drawn upon this useful additional chapter for my own, widely expanded Chapter Twelve 'The Turks in Anatolia'. In 1371/1982 there appeared *Silsilahā-yi Islāmī*, an unauthorised Persian translation by one Farīdūn Badra'ī, *Mu'assasa-yi Muṭāla'at wa Taḥqīqāt Farhangī*, 358 pp. In 1994, there appeared at Kuwait an authorised Arabic translation by the late Ḥusayn 'Alī al-Lubūdī, under the general supervision of Dr Sulaymān Ibrāhīm al-'Askarī, *al-Usar al-ḥākima fi 'l-Islām. Dirāsa fi 'l-ta'rīkh wa 'l-ansāb*, Mu'assasat al-Shirā' al-'Arabī, 293 pp.

The original book is thus still proving useful in these parts of the world through translations, although the Edinburgh University Press original is now out of print in both the original hardback and the paperback versions (the latter, of 1980, contained some slight corrections, all that the process of largely verbatim reproduction allowed). But well before the book became finally out of print, I had been noting corrections and gathering fresh information for a new, considerably expanded version. It would be strange if the explosion of knowledge over the last thirty years had not brought much fresh information for the Islamic

chronologist and genealogist, from such disciplines as historical research, epigraphy and numismatics. Much of the relevant information is, however, scattered, and, in regard to epigraphy and numismatics in particular, often appears in the local publications of the countries concerned and is not easily accessible in Britain and Western Europe. I have nevertheless endeavoured, with assistance and advice from specialist colleagues and friends (who are detailed and appropriately thanked at the end of this Introduction), to incorporate as much of this new information as possible, though certain periods and areas remain – and perhaps always will remain – dark.

Most obvious to the reader of this present book will be the fact that it is much bigger than the 1967 book. There are now seventeen chapters, covering 186 dynasties, whereas the original *Islamic Dynasties* had only ten chapters, covering 82 dynasties. The new or vastly expanded chapters include ones dealing with Muslim Spain, with much more detailed coverage of the *Mulūk al-Tawā'if* (Chapter Two); the Arabian peninsula, again with much greater detail (Chapter Six); West Africa, and East Africa and the Horn of Africa, both entirely new chapters (Chapters Seven and Eight); the Turks of Anatolia, now with detailed coverage of the Beyliks there (Chapter Twelve); Central Asia after the Mongols, a substantially new chapter which includes the Khanates arising there out of the Turco-Mongol domination of Inner Asia and persisting until the extension of Russian imperial power through Central Asia (Chapter Fifteen); Afghanistan and the Indian Subcontinent, with increased coverage of, for example, the Sultanates of the Deccan and the Indian dynasties of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Chapter Sixteen); and South-East Asia and Indonesia, again dealing with an entirely new region (Chapter Seventeen). But apart from these ones specifically mentioned, virtually all chapters are enlarged to some extent or other.

Thus the coverage of the new book approaches much more closely to coverage of the whole Islamic world, from Senegal to Borneo, than did the 1967 book, since it has often in the past been noted that works purporting to deal with Islam or the Islamic world have tended to concentrate on the Arab-Persian-Turkish heartlands to the neglect of the fringes, even though such peripheral regions as South and South-East Asia and Indonesia now contain the majority of Muslim peoples. Yet somewhat in extenuation of this concentration in the past on the heartlands, it must be admitted that the historian and chronologist of the peripheries is on much shakier ground. The heartlands have been long Islamised; many of their lands possess ancient historiographical traditions, with reliable dynastic histories and clearly-dated coins inscribed with a plethora of information on names and titlature. Whereas in regions far from the heartlands such as sub-Saharan Africa, South-East Asia and Indonesia, there may well be a care for local tribal or dynastic traditions, their recording in clearly-dated written form has nevertheless been patchy, and the task of making such records has often been complicated by attempts, of a mythic nature, to prove the ancient reception of the Islamic faith by families and classes ruling over lands and subjects which remained largely pagan for lengthy periods subsequently. The coinage of such ruling strata is nearly always much less complete in dated series, and in actual information on the coins, than for the Islamic heartlands and the Indian Subcontinent. The difficulties involved in constructing king-lists and chronologies in such circumstances may be discerned below, with reference to, for example, the kings of

Songhay (no. 59), the rulers of Kanem and Bornu (no. 60), the Sultans of Kilwa (no. 62) and the Sultans of Brunei (no. 186).

Even so, the position in such a region, comparatively near to the heartlands, as early Islamic Central Asia is far from crystal-clear. Zambaur confessed seventy years ago regarding the Qarakhanids of Transoxania and eastern Turkestan that this was 'la seule grande dynastie musulmane dont la généalogie est restée obscure' (*Manuel*, 206 n. 1). Much elucidation has meanwhile come from such scholars as Omeljan Pritsak and Elena A. Davidovich, but significant problems remain; the substantially increased numbers of coins now finding their way from Central Asia and Afghanistan to the West since the demise of the USSR may possibly resolve some of these remaining obscurities.

In the Introduction to the 1967 book, I traced the development of Islamic chronological and genealogical studies and listings from Stanley Lane-Poole's seminal *The Mohammadan Dynasties* (1893), through the more specific work of F. Justi in his *Iranisches Namenbuch* (1895) and the expansions and improvements upon Lane-Poole by W. Barthold in his *Musulmanskiy dynastii* (1899), E. Sachau in his 'Ein Verzeichnis Muhammedanischer Dynastien' (1923), and Khalil Ed'hem in his *Düwel-i Islāmiyye* (1345/1927), to E. de Zambaur's almost entirely new and monumental *Manuel de généalogie et de chronologie pour l'histoire de l'Islam* (1927).³ It does not seem necessary to repeat here all these details, except to note that no-one has attempted since the publication of Zambaur's work to update it as a whole; although a stupendous work for its time, its inaccuracies and erroneous renderings of names appear more and more obvious with the lapse of time.

I opined in 1967 that such an updating and rewriting could probably only be done as a cooperative effort by historians who are specialists in various sectors of the Islamic world, aided by epigraphists and numismatists. The prospects of such a collaboration seem no nearer in 1995 than they did twenty-nine years ago. Hence my *New Islamic Dynasties*, here presented to the scholarly world, does not aim at such overall completeness as Zambaur essayed (although he did not in fact achieve it; his attempts at covering dynasties in sub-Saharan Africa, the Indian Ocean islands and Indonesia were fragmentary and feeble to the point of uselessness); but I think I may venture to say that it represents as extensive a coverage of Islamic dynasties as one person is likely to achieve in our present day. I have endeavoured to cover what might be termed the first, second and third ranks of dynasties and to give as up-to-date and accurate information on them as possible. There remains the fourth rank and beyond, and readers may well have pet dynasties and ruling houses in which they are especially interested and which they consider ought to have been included. I can only plead that one must draw the line somewhere, and that I have left plenty of opportunities for other researchers; such readers might, for instance, care to get their teeth into elucidating the *Šudūr* of Bukhara, the *Wālīs* of Badakhshān, the Khāns of Sibir, the sultans of the Sulu archipelago and the Moro rulers of Mindanāo in the southern Philippines, etc. Moreover, an extensive field remains open for future scholars, one which Zambaur tackled valiantly and to some extent successfully, namely that of elucidating the lines of viziers to the rulers of such dynasties as the 'Abbāsids, the Fāṭimids, the Būyids, the Great Seljuqs and their related branches, and the Ottomans. Zambaur also set forth the series of provincial

governors in the *amsār* or military concentration-points of the Arab caliphate, and he tentatively envisaged a second edition of his *Manuel* (which never appeared, although the author did not die until 1941) in which he would tackle the local governors of a host of other cities of the east, such as Tabriz, Isfahan, Hamadhan, Marw, Bukhara and Samarkand. Certainly, in regard to the viziers, our increased knowledge of the 'Abbasid and Seljuq vizierates, for instance, and the chronological researches of such Turkish scholars as İsmail Hami Danişmendli in his *İzahlı Osmanlı tarihi kronolojisi*, Istanbul 1947–71, in regard to the Ottoman viziers, should enable fuller and more accurate lists to be compiled, above all, of the innumerable, rapidly-changing Ottoman viziers. Similarly, the publication of many texts out of the rich genre of local histories, which has flourished in the Iranian and Central Asian lands from classical times virtually until the present day, would enable us to reconstruct the history and chronology of the ruling strata in many of the cities mentioned above by Zambaur.

A feature of Lane-Poole's *The Mohammadan Dynasties* was the short historical account of each dynasty prefixed to its relevant entry, accounts which, he said,

do not attempt to relate the internal history of each dynasty: they merely show its place in relation to other dynasties, and trace its origin, its principal extensions, and its downfall; they seek to define the boundaries of its dominions, and to describe the chief steps in its aggrandisement and in its decline. (p. vi)

Zambaur agreed that 'Il eût été agréable de trouver, en tête de chaque dynastie, un aperçu succinct de ses origines, de son développement et de sa fin', but, for reasons of space and economy, renounced 'ses introductions qui forment un attrait séduisant du livre de M. St. Lane-Poole' (*Manuel*, p. vii). Nevertheless, the accounts here of Lane-Poole were most useful, especially in pre-*Encyclopaedia of Islam* days, and have still seemed to me eminently desirable for a work on Islamic dynastic chronology. A bare list of rulers and their dates would admittedly be of use to specialist Islamic historians and numismatists, who would know where to look for historical information on the dynasties in question (though this might well take them down some obscure pathways). But historical introductions to the dynasties seem to me essential for students and non-specialists. My own aim, as in 1967, has been similar to that of Lane-Poole: not so much to give a potted history as to place the dynasty in the broad context of Islamic history; to outline some of the major trends of its period; and, where relevant, to indicate some of the dynasty's achievements. I have tried to make the bibliographical references at the end of each section fuller than in the 1967 book. As well as including works specifically useful for illuminating the chronology and titulature of the dynasty, I have given references to a series of general works dealing with the dynasty concerned, and to a selection at least of specific studies, where such general works and special studies exist. But the references here are not meant to be in any way exhaustive, nor are they meant to replace the detailed information available in the bibliographies to the various dynasties in the new edition of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* entries, or set forth in the latest French version (*Introduction à l'histoire du monde musulman médiéval VII^e–XV^e siècle. Méthodologie et éléments de bibliographie*, Paris 1982) of the late Claude Cahen's refonte, expansion and updating of Jean Sauvaget's *Introduction à l'histoire de l'Orient Musulman: éléments de bibliographie* (with additions and corrections, Paris 1946) (English version, unfortunately with rather more cursory

bibliographical references, *Introduction to the History of the Muslim East: A Bibliographical Guide*, Berkeley and Los Angeles 1965). Also, there has very recently appeared *Etats, sociétés et cultures du monde musulman médiéval Xe–XVe siècles*, Tome 1, Paris 1995, written by a team of specialists (Jean-Claude Garçin, Michel Ballivet, Thierry Bianquis, Henri Bresc, Jean Calmard, Marc Gaborieau, Pierre Guichard and Jean-Louis Triaud) and containing a very extensive section *Les outils de travail* with up-to-date bibliographical references, maps and genealogical tables (pp. vii–ccxi). For the more recent history of the Islamic lands, there are also bibliographical references in general histories such as Ira Lapidus's *A History of Islamic Societies* (Cambridge 1988) and in such encyclopaedic works as Francis Robinson, *Atlas of the Islamic World since 1500*, Oxford 1982; Trevor Mostyn and Albert Hourani (eds), *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the Middle East and North Africa*, Cambridge 1988; Francis Robinson (ed.), *The Cambridge History of India, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka*, Cambridge 1989; and John L. Esposito (ed.), *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern Islamic World*, Oxford 1995. These are all recently published and contain presumably up-to-date bibliographical information. For the classical period of Islamic history, however, such works mentioned above as those of Lapidus, and of Robinson in his *Atlas of the Islamic World* (whose timespan covers both the later mediaeval and the modern periods), can profitably be consulted, but it is a matter of alphabetical chance whether the entry in the new edition of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* dates from the late 1940s or 1950s, when the second edition was conceived and first published (as in the case of, for example, the 'Abbāsids and the Būyids), or from the last few years (as in the case, for example, of the Mamlūks, the Mughals, the Ottomans and the Šafawids). If the former, then the bibliographical references are distinctly out of date, and I have endeavoured here to supply some more recent ones.

Since various numismatic colleagues have, over the years, told me how useful they have found the 1967 book, it has seemed to that more information might be included in this new book for the numismatist. The study of coins, and the information which their legends yield on titulature, accession dates, periods of power, extent of territories ruled over, etc., have long been recognised as constituting an invaluable ancillary discipline for the Islamic dynastic and political historian (and equally, for different reasons, for the economic and social one).⁴ I have tried to use, wherever possible, numismatic evidence in compiling the present lists of rulers and their dates, and have listed significant numismatic sources in the bibliographies for each dynasty where such sources exist. Also, as an innovatory feature of the present book, in the dynastic lists I have marked those rulers who issued coins, following the convention established by Zambaur in his *Manuel* of prefixing a small circle to their dates and name, in the hope that this will be a worthwhile extra feature for the numismatist and historian alike. In general, I have disregarded the numismatic information given by Zambaur, which was not free from coin misattributions, and have derived my own information, where possible, from coin catalogues, the various studies on the coinages of specific dynasties, such as exist, for example, for the Idrīsids, the Spanish Muslim dynasties, the Fāṭimids, the Ayyūbids and the Mamlūks, and from the monthly lists of coins offered for sale by Mr Stephen Album of Santa Rosa, California. I am aware of the difficulties involved in deciding whether a

specific dynasty or ruler issued its or his own coins, with personal names and titles on them, or whether a ruler was content to issue coins in the name of his suzerain, as were, for example, the Beys of Tunis up to the later nineteenth century, the Qaramānli governors of Tripoli, and the rulers from the house of Muḥammad 'Alī in Egypt until the early twentieth century, all of which rulers for long minted coins in the names of their suzerains (however nominal this suzerainty might ultimately become), the Ottoman Sultan-Caliphs. On the whole, I have tended to regard only those coins with the full names and titles of the actual minting authority as evidence for the independent issue of coins by the dynasty or ruler in question, but am conscious that some inconsistencies may have crept in here.

Following Lane-Poole, I have given dates in both the Muslim *Hijrī* and the Christian eras. It should be noted by those unfamiliar with the Muslim system of dating that the pre-Islamic Arabs used a lunar calendar of twelve months (because observation of the moon's phases was the only possible basis for time-reckoning in a desert environment) with intercalation (*nasi'*) of an extra month every two or three years in order to keep some relation with the solar year and with the rhythm of the agricultural seasons, and in order to fix the great annual fairs of Arabia at the same time each year. The Prophet Muḥammad introduced a lunar year, forbidding intercalation and thus throwing the old Arabian system out of gear. It was the second caliph 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb who tactfully regulated the system. He decreed that the lunar year of twelve months should continue, beginning it now, however, on the first day of the Arabian year in which Muḥammad had made his *Hijra* or migration from Mecca to Medina, namely 16 July AD 622. Furthermore, 'Umar added days to the alternate lunar months, and also an additional day to the final month of the year every three years (such a leap year being called a *sana kabīsa*). Thus the lunar year normally consisted of 354 days grouped into twelve months alternately of twenty-nine and thirty days, but, in a *kabīsa* year, it consisted of 355 days. The *Hijrī* months therefore do not correspond with the four seasons of the year, as do the Christian Gregorian or the Jewish months, but begin slightly earlier, by approximately eleven days each solar year. For instance, the month of Ramaḍān 1387 began on 3 December 1967. Because of the eleven days' disparity, the next Ramaḍān began on 22 November 1968. It is taking about thirty-two and a half Christian-era years before Ramaḍān will begin again in early December (in fact, 9 December 1999 = 1 Ramaḍān 1420). In this way, the 100 years in a Muslim-era century are approximately equal to ninety-seven Christian years.

It has been difficult and tedious to convert quickly from Christian to *Hijrī* dates and vice versa by arithmetical means, so recourse has traditionally been made to conversion tables.⁵ (The present availability of instantaneous computer programs for converting dates now makes this easy for the scholar sitting in his study with a computer, but tables in book form will doubtless continue to be the most convenient way of finding equivalents for the traveller or the worker in the field viewing such epigraphic texts as inscriptions on tombstones or dedications on buildings.) In fact, a shifting lunar calendar has obvious disadvantages for the fixing of recurrent agricultural operations or financial transactions, and solar calendars soon came into use in the Islamic world for these practical purposes. Today, most of the Islamic world follows the European Gregorian calendar for

purely secular and everyday purposes. Iran and Afghanistan, however, have since the earlier decades of the twentieth century used a solar *Hijrī* year, namely one having as its starting point the year of Muḥammad's *Hijra* (AD 622) but calculated thereafter on a solar basis. However, the primary records for Islamic history up to the nineteenth century (and, in certain regions, into the twentieth century), whether written in manuscripts and produced in the shape of early printed or lithographed books, or in numismatic and epigraphic legends, are almost invariably dated in the *Hijrī* system, so that dates of accessions, deaths, durations of reigns, etc., are here given in it.

Since the Christian and Muslim years hardly ever correspond, it follows that it is impossible to give equivalent Christian dates for historical events in the Islamic world with complete accuracy unless the month and day of the *Hijrī* year are known (strictly speaking, one needs also to know the exact time of day for an event, given the fact that Muslims, like Jews, calculated the beginning of a day not from midnight but from sunset on the previous evening). But although some mediaeval Islamic historians were remarkably accurate over the pinpointing of events, others were not, and might give only the year of an occurrence; inscriptions are usually exactly dated, but coins only occasionally give the month of their minting. Hence in this book, I have followed two basic principles in giving the Christian equivalent of Muslim dates (and in a very few cases – see below – when giving the Muslim equivalent of Christian dates).

First, where possible I have ascertained from my sources the exact day, or at least the month, of the event during the year in question, and have converted to the Christian era on this basis. Zambaur gave only Muslim-era dates, with citation of the exact day and month where possible, and did not give Christian-era equivalents; Lane-Poole gave dates in both eras, and explained that his basic principle was to cite the Christian year in which the *Hijrī* year in question began, except that when the *Hijrī* year began towards the close of a Christian year he gave the following AD year (*The Mohammadan Dynasties*, p. vii n. *), and this he regarded as adequate for practical purposes. Second, where exact information on the day or month is lacking in my sources, I have simply taken the equivalent Christian year as the one in which the greater part of the Muslim year fell; and if the Muslim year began halfway through the Christian year (i.e. at the end of June or the beginning of July), I have taken the Christian year as the one in which the first half of the Muslim year fell. As with Lane-Poole's system, the equivalents arrived at this way are clearly not always going to be right, but this procedure seems to me in the present context preferable to the cumbersome citation of two Christian years. Thus I have written 741/1340 instead of the more exact 741/1340–1.

The difficulties of correctly setting forth the Christian- and Muslim-era dates are one thorny aspect of Islamic chronology. Another one arises from the often confused circumstances of rulers' succession to power. The great Arabic chroniclers, such as al-Ṭabarī and 'Izz al-Dīn Ibn al-Athīr (on the latter of whom Zambaur relied heavily for his dating of pre-thirteenth-century dynasties of the Middle Eastern heartlands – cf. his *Manuel*, pp. v–vi), were often wonderfully exact in recording dates, on occasion down to the very time of day when events occurred; but, when one goes out beyond the major dynasties of the heartlands, sources often grow sparse and at times barely exist. Sometimes the literary

evidence contradicts that of coin legends and of inscriptions; in this connection, it is well known that such monetary and epigraphic texts do not always reflect reality but might be struck or carved for tendentious, propaganda purposes, and hence be at variance with what was really happening. Even when all the relevant dates are known, it may be difficult to decide which one to choose as an exact accession date. In mediaeval Christendom, the actual accession of a monarch was usually followed by a formal coronation. In mediaeval England, it came to involve both the secular and religious sealing of approval (the Recognition and the Anointing, followed by the Crowning), and the whole act might take place several months after actual accession (in regard to Edgar of Mercia during Anglo-Saxon times, fourteen years later!). The Islamic equivalent of such a ceremony was the official offering by the great men of state and representatives of the religious institution of the *bay'a*, literally 'hand clasping' (cf. the mediaeval European *manumissio*), by which fealty was pledged (the act of *mubāya'a*). Or such pledging might take place at the formal ceremony of *julūs*, the ruler's 'seating' on his throne ('*arsh, sarīr*'), often accompanied by his publicly taking up and flourishing such insignia of royalty as a sword (*al-taqlīd bi 'l-sayf*, in Ottoman Turkish *qīlich qushanması*), or a sceptre/rod (*qadīb, khayzurān*) or staff ('*aşā*'), in the case of the Umayyad and 'Abbāsid caliphs, with whom the rod or staff in question was assumed to be a legacy from the Prophet Muḥammad himself.⁶ The date when a claimant first seized power, occupying the capital or a major part of the kingdom, would obviously be anterior to such ceremonies; is this, then, to be considered as the start of a reign? Also, among the early Ottomans, up to c. AD 1600, for instance, there was often a slight interregnum between the death of a sultan, during which the throne was technically unoccupied, and the new incumbent taking the throne. The demise of the previous ruler was meanwhile concealed from the public until the heir to the throne, the *walī 'l-'ahd*, could return from his provincial governorship and assume power in the capital, the great fear being of an outbreak of disorder and civil strife between rival claimants.⁷ Moreover, a first *julūs* might be followed by a second ceremony, as sometimes happened among the Il Khānids of Persia, when the Great Khān in distant Qaraqorum or Peking signified his approval and assent to the succession to power of the provincial Khāns, his theoretical subordinates; thus the Il Khān Arghun was enthroned in 683/1284 after the execution of his uncle Aḥmad Tegüder, but a second ceremony took place twenty months later in 685/1286 when a *yarligh* or document containing the Great Khān Qubilay's agreement had arrived.⁸

Nor can one always rely on having *Hijrī* dates available for constructing a dynastic chronology. Several of the dates of the Naṣrid kings of Granada during the last century of that dynasty's existence, the fifteenth century, are known only from Castilian Spanish chronicles, coins being known for only a few of the rulers of that time. For the chronology of some of the minor states of the Indian Ocean shores, peninsular India, Malaysia and Indonesia, Portuguese and then Dutch and British historical information is important. West African dynasties like Mali, Songhay and the sultans in Hausaland often handed down king-lists which have to be correlated, as far as possible, with the *Hijrī* dates.

Yet another difficulty in setting down the names of rulers in a consistent yet intelligible form arises from the complex system of Arabic and Islamic nomen-

clature, especially where rulers and great men of state were concerned. As well as the given name (*ism*) – these names being rather limited in number – all Muslims (even children, before they could biologically become fathers or mothers) could have a patronymic (*kunya*), composed of Abū ‘father of ...’ or Umm ‘mother of ...’. They might further have a *nisba*, indicating profession, religious or legal affiliation, place of origin of the holder or of his family, etc., for example al-Sarrāj ‘the saddler’, al-Ḥanafī ‘follower of the law school of Abū Ḥanīfa’, al-Dimashqī ‘the man from Damascus’, etc. Any Muslim might also have a nickname (*nabaz*, *laqab*), such as Ta’abbata Sharran ‘he who carries an evil under his arm’, or al-Akḥṭal ‘having a fleshy and pendulous ear, a cauliflower ear’. Additionally, as time went on, the ruler himself, and members of the ruling classes, military or civilian, would almost certainly have an honorific title or nickname, also called a *laqab*, for example Dhu ‘l-Riyāsatayn ‘possessor of the two functions [civil and military]’ or Jalāl al-Dawla ‘exalted one of the state’. Any one or other of all these elements might be the one by which a person was generally or best known [his or her *shuhra*], and the *shuhras* of mediaeval times might not always be the ones by which a person is best known today; thus classical Arabic sources more often refer to the poet al-Mutanabbī by his *kunya* of Abu ‘l-Ṭayyib.⁹

From the tenth century AD onwards, honorific titles of this type began to proliferate among the holders of power, eventually extending to religious scholars and literary figures, with an inevitable cheapening of their significance. The study of this titulature is a fascinating one for the historian or epigrapher or numismatist, and can often throw significant light on historical events and trends.¹⁰ But the piling-up of increasingly grandiloquent honorifics in the titulature of a single ruler poses problems for the Islamic chronologer. Not infrequently, these titles become so long-winded and numerous that a choice has to be made: which one(s) to include in a book such as the present one? One factor involved is the question of the names by which a ruler was and still is best known. In some instances, the choice is easy; thus Maḥmūd of Ghazna is best known as holder of the *laqab* Yamīn al-Dawla. For others, the choice is less obvious. In the 1967 *Islamic Dynasties*, I tended to give simplified versions of long strings of titles, setting down the one or ones which seemed to me the most familiar and the most significant for identification and differentiation purposes. In the *New Islamic Dynasties*, I have been more generous in recording honorifics; and, as well as giving the *ism* in the first place, I have always added the *kunya*, where known, and have endeavoured to display the *nasab* or string of filiation for at least one generation back, for example Aḥmad b. al-Ḥasan, or for more than one generation back when this is necessary for clarity or identificatory purposes, for example Aḥmad b. al-Ḥasan b. Ja’far. This should in many cases enable the construction of a *nasab* for a dynasty, always assuming that there is father-son or grandfather-son or ruler-brother, etc., succession. Of course, such neat succession is far from general in Islam, and questions of succession might frequently be settled by the interposition of the sword. Also, at the outset of the new faith and society, there still survived the feeling that the inheritance of power should be by any capable male relative within a clan or family; only with the ‘Abbāsīd caliphs did father-son succession become more usual, though by no means universal. When Turkish and then Turco-Mongol dynasties appeared in later mediaeval times, tribal

customs and a patrimonial conception of the sharing of power often led to succession not necessarily by a son but possibly by other members of the ruling family. When this occurred within a dynasty, I have tried to indicate the relationship of the new ruler to his predecessor by giving the kin connection, where this is known.

Clearly, the ideal would be to have genealogical tables, as had Lane-Poole, Barthold, Zambaur and Khalīl Ed'hem. Alas, the days when publishers were willing to lavish space and to swallow the typographical complications involved in the construction of genealogical stemmas, let alone to countenance hand-inserted fold-out tables, are now past. The attempt which I have made to show genealogical filiation by giving two or more terms in a *nasab* represents a second-best compared with the provision of spaciouly set-out tables, but I hope that my practice here will go some way to obviate the sort of criticism made, with some justice, of the 1967 book, that it was a chronological handbook but not a genealogical one.

The Arabic-type names of the early lines of rulers in the Arabic heartlands of the Middle East and North Africa present the problems of arrangement and choice touched upon above. The Iranian names found among many of the Kurdish, Daylamī and Caucasian dynasties which rose to prominence during what the late V. Minorsky called 'the Iranian intermezzo' of the tenth to the twelfth centuries AD at times present problems where dialectical and hypocoristic forms of names are involved; here, recourse to such a work as Justi's *Iranisches Namenbuch* is available. From the eleventh century onwards, dynasties of Turkish military slave or tribal origin, followed by Turco-Mongol ones from the thirteenth century onwards, rapidly spread across the northern tier of the Islamic world of Western and South Asia and of North Africa, so that rulers of Turkish origin eventually ruled most of the Islamic lands between Algiers in the west and Bengal and Assam in the east, extending as far south as Yemen in the Arabian peninsula and the Deccan in South India. The rendering of the Turkish names by which many of these holders of power were known involves yet more problems, for these names often appear in Arabic script in deformed, at times barely recognisable, versions. I have set down the correct Turkish and Mongol forms where this has been ascertainable; but, where there is considerable divergence between them and the Arabic orthography, this last is noted in parentheses, thus Hülegü (Hülākū), Öljeitü (Üljaytū), Negübey (Nikpāy). However, I have left the familiar transliteration of the Turkish name Tīmūr as applied to the great conqueror, although the more correct rendering Temür is used for other possessors of this name, as in, for example, Toqay Temürids. Where Ottoman Turkish pronunciation of Arabic names produced forms somewhat divergent from the standard Arabic pronunciation of these names, these are likewise noted in parentheses, thus Muḥammad (Meḥemmed), 'Uthmān ('Othmān), Bāyazīd (Bāyezīd), Sulaymān (Süleymān). For the dynasties of sub-Saharan West and East Africa, the renderings of Arabic names in the indigenous languages have often been followed, thus Bukaru for Abū Bakr, Aliyu for 'Ālī. A similar procedure for the names of some of the Malaysian and Indonesian dynasties has been adopted.

I have attempted to make the indexes as full as possible, in order to facilitate identifying rulers, with cross-referencing where necessary; and I have further given standard, Europeanised forms such as Saladin and Tamerlane.

There remains the pleasant task of thanking various colleagues who have patiently answered queries or provided information from their own special fields in Islamic history. They include Professor Barbara Watson Andaya (Indonesia and Malaysia); Dr Mohamed Ben Madani (the Beys of Tunis); Professor A. D. H. Bivar (West Africa); Dr Peter Carey (Java); Dr E. van Donzel (Harar); Professor Antonio Fernández-Puertas (Muslim Spain); Dr Greville Freeman-Grenville (East Africa); Dr Peter Jackson (the Delhi Sultanate); Professor Irfan Habib (the Nawwābs of Bengal); Professor Alexander Knysh (post-Mongol Central Asia); Dr David Morgan (the Mongols); Professor Giovanni Oman (Sicily); Dr C. E. R. Pennell (Indonesia and Malaysia); Dr Muhammad Yusuf Siddiq (Bengal); and Professor G. Rex Smith (the Arabian peninsula). For help on numismatics, I am equally indebted to Mr Stephen Album, Mrs Helen Mitchell Brown, Dr J. Leyten and Mr William F. Spengler. Such libraries as the John Rylands University Library at Manchester, the Library of the School of Oriental and African Studies, London, the Indian Institute Library, Oxford, and the Heberden Coin Room Library in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford, have provided much of the background literature. Dr Freeman-Grenville has also provided much wisdom in the thorny field of eras and chronology. Finally, it is a pleasure to have this new version of an old book, which was part of the Islamic Surveys series, appear from Edinburgh University Press, and I am grateful for much general encouragement from the series adviser, Dr Carole Hillenbrand and for the skill of the Press staff and their typesetters in coping with such a complex manuscript.

NOTES

1. See *The Islamic Dynasties*, Introduction, p. xi and n. 1.
2. It is duly acknowledged in what are now the two fullest and most up-to-date, standard works on world rulers and governments, G. C. Allen (ed.), *Rulers and Governments of the World*, 3 vols, London 1978 (chronological arrangement), and Peter Truhart, *Regents of Nations. Systematic Chronology of States and their Political Representatives in Past and Present: A Biographical Reference Book*, 3 vols. in 4 parts, Munich 1984–8 (arrangement by areas; vol. II covers Asia and Australia-Oceania). It may be noted that these works replace the pioneer, but largely outdated, book by A. M. H. J. Stokvis, *Manuel d'histoire, de généalogie et de chronologie de tous les états du globe*, 3 vols, Leiden 1888–91, and also B. Spuler (ed.), *Regenten und Regierungen der Welt*, 2nd edn, Würzburg 1962.
3. *The Islamic Dynasties*, pp. xi–xiii.
4. The brief general study by Philip Grierson, *Numismatics and History*, Historical Association pamphlets, General series no. G19, London 1951, is still well worth consulting.
5. These are accessible in several places, for example in C. H. Philips (ed.), *Handbook of Oriental History*, The Royal Historical Society, London 1951, 33–40; Sir Thomas W. Haig, *Comparative Tables of Muhammadan and Christian Dates*, London 1932; H. G. Cattenoz, *Tables de concordance des ères chrétiennes et hégiennes*, Rabat 1954; V. V. Tsybul'skiy, *Sovremennyye kalendari stran blizhnetsa i srednogo vostoka*, Moscow 1964; G. S. P. Freeman-Grenville, *The Islamic and Christian Calendars AD 622–2222 (AH1–1650). A Complete Guide for Converting Christian and Islamic Dates and Dates of Festivals*, Garnet Publishing, Reading 1995 (= a new version of his *The Muslim and Christian Calendars*, first published London 1963, including corrections which the author was not allowed to make to the first edition and its reprint). The fullest

- treatment, including not only the *Hijrī* calendar but also the various other eras in use in the Middle East and the Iranian lands at various times, is by F. Wüstenfeld and E. Mahler, *Vergleichungs-Tabellen zur islamischen und iranischen Zeitrechnung*, 3rd edn, revised by J. Mayr and B. Spuler, Wiesbaden 1961.
6. Dr Freeman-Grenville has pointed out to me that, at Kilwa in East Africa (see below, no. 62), the formal Recognition was by mention in the Friday *khutba*.
 7. See A. D. Alderson, *The Structure of the Ottoman Dynasty*, Oxford 1956, 37–45.
 8. See *EtR*, art. 'Argün Khan' (Peter Jackson).
 9. An excellent survey of the Arabic name and its component parts was begun by L. Caetani and G. Gabrieli in their *Onomasticon arabicum ossia repertorio alfabetico dei nomi di persona e di luogo contenuti nelle principali opere storiche, biografiche e geografiche, stampate e manoscritto, relative all'Islām. I Fonti – Introduzione*, Rome 1915, but unfortunately the project lapsed for over half a century. It has now happily been taken up again by an international team based in Paris, under the direction of Mme Jacqueline Sublet, who are producing fascicules of the new *Onomasticon* and a series of *Cahiers d'onomastique arabe*. For the most up-to-date, detailed and scholarly treatment of the name in Arabic, including the cultural, literary and historical aspects, see now Jacqueline Sublet, *Le voile du nom. Essai sur le nom propre arabe*, Paris 1991, and, in a rather briefer compass, Annemarie Schimmel, *Islamic Names*, Edinburgh 1989. For the *laqab* in particular, see the article s.v. in *EtR*² (C. E. Bosworth).
 10. Thus P. Guichard has recently suggested that the form of the favoured *laqab* of the 'Āmirid *hājib* Ibn Abī 'Āmir in late tenth-century Muslim Spain, al-Mansūr *tout court*, and of the similar honorifics of the members of the 'Āmirid family who followed him (see below, Chapter Two, no. 4), reflects their limited pretensions to fully legitimate sovereignty in the Umayyad caliphate; the later Spanish Umayyads, like their rivals the 'Abbāsids, used honorifics of this type, but with such complements expressing divine help or dependence on God as *bi 'llāh* or *'alā 'llāh*. See his 'Al-Mansūr ou al-Mansūr *bi llāh*? Les *laqab*/s des 'Āmirides d'après la numismatique et les documents officiels', *Archéologie Islamique*, 5 (1995), 47–53.

Post-scriptum

A French translation of the original *Islamic Dynasties* by Yves Thoraval, *Les dynasties musulmanes*, has recently appeared from Editions Sindbad, Paris 1996, 340 pp., with some slight updating of the entries on dynasties surviving into the last third of the present century and some new bibliographical references, mainly intended for a Francophone readership.

ONE

The Caliphs

1

THE RIGHTLY-GUIDED OR 'PATRIARCHAL' OR 'ORTHODOX' CALIPHS
(AL-KHULAFĀ' AL-RĀSHIDŪN)
11–40/632–61

- 11/632 Abū Bakr 'Atīq, Ibn Abī Quḥāfa, al-Ṣiddīq
13/634 Abū Ḥafṣ 'Umar (I) b. al-Khaṭṭāb, al-Fārūq
23/644 Abū 'Amr or Abū 'Abdallāh or Abū Laylā 'Uthmān b.
'Affān, Dhu 'l-Nūrayn
35–40/656–61 Abu 'l-Ḥasan 'Alī b. Abī Ṭālib, al-Imām al-Murtaḍā
40/661 *Umayyad caliphs*

On the Prophet Muḥammad's death at Medina in 11/632, four of his Companions, all closely related to him either through marriage or through blood, succeeded him as temporal leaders of the infant Muslim *umma* or community. They assumed the title of *Khalīfa* or Caliph (literally, 'he who follows behind, successor'), with responsibility for the upholding and spreading of the new faith and the well-being of Muḥammad's people, and – at least in the case of the first three of these caliphs – general recognition as the interpreters of the faith and religious leaders of the community.

Abū Bakr was the father of the Prophet's virgin wife and favourite, 'Ā'isha, and was one of his oldest and most trusted supporters. It was he who imposed the authority of the capital Medina over the outlying parts of the Arabian peninsula, such as Najd, Bahrayn, Oman ('Umān) and Yemen, after many of the Bedouin tribes had renounced their personal allegiance to Muḥammad (the *Ridda* Wars). 'Umar's daughter Ḥafṣa was also a wife of the Prophet, and it was under 'Umar's vigorous direction that the martial energies of the desert Arabs were turned outside the peninsula against the Byzantine territories of Syria, Palestine and Egypt and against the Sāsānid Persian ones of Iraq and Persia. 'Umar was also a capable organiser, and both the introduction of a rudimentary civil administration for the conquered provinces and the invention of the register or *dīwān* system for paying the Arab warriors' stipends are attributed to him. It was he who abandoned the increasingly clumsy title of 'Successor of the Successor of the Messenger of God' in favour of the simple term 'caliph' and who further adopted the designation of *Amīr al-Mu'minīn* 'Commander of the Faithful', perhaps implying a spiritual as well as a purely secular, political element in his leadership.

'Uthmān was, through his wife Ruqayya, the Prophet's son-in-law, and was elected caliph after 'Umar's murder by a small council (*shūrā*) of the leading Companions, but his reign ended in a rebellion by discontented elements and his death in 35/656. This assassination inaugurated a period of strife and counter-strife (*fitna*, literally 'temptation, trial [of the believer's faith]'), and for this

reason it was later often referred to as *al-Bāb al-maftūh* 'the door opened [to civil warfare]'. The last of the Rightly-Guided Caliphs, 'Alī, was doubly related to Muḥammad as his cousin and, through his marriage to Fātima, as his son-in-law, and as a child had been brought up with the Prophet. Thus in the eyes of certain pious circles, those who later formed the nucleus of the *shī'a* at 'Alī or 'party of 'Alī' (or simply, the Shī'a), he was particularly well fitted to succeed to the Prophet's heritage. But he was never able to enforce his authority all though the Islamic lands, for Syria and then Egypt were controlled by Mu'āwiya, governor of Syria (see below, no. 2). 'Alī moved his capital out of the Arabian peninsula to Kūfa in Iraq, and attempted to rally the Arab tribesmen of Iraq to his side. He confronted Mu'āwiya in battle at Ṣiffīn on the upper Euphrates in 37/657, but had no decisive success. He was murdered in 40/661 by one of the Khārijīs, a radical, egalitarian group which had seceded from 'Alī's army; his son al-Ḥasan half-heartedly succeeded to the caliphate in Iraq, but was speedily bought out by Mu'āwiya and renounced his rights to the caliphate, which now passed to the Umayyads (see below, no. 2).

In later centuries, the age of the first four caliphs came to be regarded, through a somewhat romantic and pious haze, as a Golden Age when faith, justice and the pristine Islamic virtues flourished. Hence the title 'rightly-guided' was applied to them, thereby distinguishing them from their successors the Umayyads, who in the eyes of the religious classes came to be regarded as impious and worldly *mulūk* 'kings' rather than religiously-inspired leaders of the community.

Lane-Poole, 3–5, 9; Zambaur, 3.

*Et*¹ 'Omar b. al-Khaṭṭāb', 'Oṭhmān b. 'Affān' (G. Levi Della Vida), *Et*² 'Abū Bakr' (W. Montgomery Watt), 'Alī b. Abī Tālib' (L. Veccia Vaglieri).

L. Veccia Vaglieri, 'The Patriarchal and Umayyad caliphates', in P. M. Holt, A. K. S. Lambton and B. Lewis (eds), *The Cambridge History of Islam*, Cambridge 1970, I, 57–103.

H. Kennedy, *The Prophet and the Age of the Caliphs, The Islamic Near East from the Sixth to the Eleventh Century*, London 1986, 50–81, with genealogical table at p. 402.

A. Noth, 'Früher Islam', in U. Haarmann (ed.), *Geschichte der arabischen Welt*, Munich 1987, 11–100.

2

THE Umayyad Caliphs 41–132/661–750

1. The Sufyānids

- o 41/661 Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān Mu'āwiya I b. Abī Sufyān
- 60/680 Abū Khalid Yazīd I b. Mu'āwiya
- 64/683 Mu'āwiya II b. Yazīd I

2. The Marwānids

- 64/684 Abū 'Abd al-Malik Marwān I b. al-Ḥakam
- o 65/685 Abu 'l-Walīd 'Abd al-Malik b. Marwān I, Abu 'l-Mulūk
- o 86/705 Abu 'l-'Abbās al-Walīd I b. 'Abd al-Malik
- o 96/715 Abū Ayyūb Sulaymān b. 'Abd al-Malik
- o 99/717 Abū Ḥafṣ 'Umar (II) b. 'Abd al-'Azīz
- o 101/720 Abu Khālīd Yazīd II b. 'Abd al-Malik,
- o 105/724 Abu 'l-Walīd Hishām b. 'Abd al-Malik
- o 125/743 Abu 'l-'Abbās al-Walīd II b. Yazīd II
- o 126/744 Abū Khālīd Yazīd III b. al-Walīd I
- o 126/744 Ibrāhīm b. al-Walīd I, k. 132/750
- o 127–32/744–50 Abū 'Abd al-Malik Marwān II b. Muḥammad, al-Ja'dī al-Himār
- 132/750 'Abbāsīd caliphs

Mu'āwiya followed 'Alī and al-Ḥasan as caliph of the Muslims, having adopted the cry of 'Vengeance for 'Uthmān' against 'Alī and his regicide supporters (Mu'āwiya and 'Uthmān were kinsmen, both of them belonging to the Meccan clan of Umayya or 'Abd Shams). Mu'āwiya had governed Syria for twenty years, and had led the warfare by land and sea against the Byzantines; he consequently had a disciplined and well-trained army to set against the anarchic Bedouins of Iraq who formed the bulk of 'Alī's support. He thus inaugurates the first branch of the Umayyads, the Sufyānids; on the death of the ephemeral caliph Mu'āwiya II, the caliphate passed – after a period of crisis when it seemed that leadership of the community might go to the Zubayrids, the family of another of Muḥammad's most prominent Companions – to Marwān I, belonging to a parallel branch of the Umayyads, from whom all the subsequent caliphs of the dynasty (and also the Spanish Umayyads: see below, no. 4) descended.

The three greatest caliphs of the dynasty, Mu'āwiya, 'Abd al-Malik and Hishām, each reigned for some twenty years from their capital Damascus, and proved first-class administrators of the empire which the Arabs were conquering. With no precedents for a theory of Islamic government over vast territories and ethnically and confessionally heterogeneous populations, but with a dynamic leadership and a system of society which moved from early rigidity to a more flexible form, the Umayyads were necessarily innovators here. Among other things, they were concerned to adapt and to incorporate within their system of

government the administrative practices of the Greeks and Persians whose former lands they now ruled over; the later Umayyad period seems to witness the introduction of several Sāsānid techniques and manners, a process which was to accelerate under the 'Abbāsids. Military expansion proceeded apace, above all, in the reign of al-Walīd I, even though the easiest conquests had now been made and the Arab troops had to campaign in remote, often mountainous regions and in harsh climatic conditions; nor did plunder come in so easily as in the first stages of Arab conquest. All of North Africa west of Egypt was occupied, and Muslim raiders passed across the Straits of Gibraltar into Spain, subsequently surmounting the Pyrenees and raiding into late Merovingian and Carolingian France. From Egypt, pressure was exerted against the Christian kingdoms of Nubia. Beyond the Caucasus, contact was made with the Turkish Khazars, and the Greek frontiers in south-eastern Anatolia and Armenia were harried. On the eastern Persian fringes, Khwārazm was invaded and Transoxania gradually conquered for Islam against the strenuous opposition of native Iranian rulers and their Turkish allies. Finally, an Arab governor penetrated through Makrān into Sind, implanting Islam for the first time on Indian soil. All these conquests not only increased the taxative resources of the empire but also brought in large numbers of slaves and clients; the use of this labour enabled the minority of Arabs in the empire to live off the conquered lands as a rentier class and to exploit some of the economic potential of regions like the Fertile Crescent.

Yet territorial expansion and economic and administrative progress did not prevent the fall of the Umayyad régime. Within the heartlands, the caliphs faced the unceasing opposition of the Arab tribesmen of Iraq and of sectarian activists like the Khārijīs. The formation of a religious institution centred on Medina made the two Holy Cities of Arabia centres of pious opposition, especially as some of these elements favoured the claims to headship of the community of 'Alī's descendants, the *Ahl al-Bayt* or 'House of the Prophet', who regarded themselves as the Imāms or divinely-designated inheritors of the prophetic charge. It was not, as anti-Umayyad views which emerged under their supplanners, the 'Abbāsids, were later to allege, that the Umayyad caliphs were mere kings, hostile to Islamic religion and introducers of the foreign practice of hereditary succession in the state. We can now discern that the Umayyads had an exalted view of the religious nature of their charge, not just as successors of the Prophet but as God's own deputies, implied by their title *Khalīfat Allāh* 'God's Caliph', and considered themselves fully competent to form and to interpret the nascent Islamic doctrine. But social tensions appeared within the caliphate at large. New classes, such as the *Mawālī* or clients, converts to Islam from the formerly subject populations, began to seek a more satisfactory social and political role within the *umma* commensurate with their numbers and their skills. Various discontents were skilfully exploited by members of a rival Meccan clan to the Umayyads, that of the descendants of the Prophet's uncle al-'Abbās. Hence after 128/746 there began in the Khurasan or eastern Persia a revolutionary movement led by an agitator of genius, Abū Muslim. The anti-Umayyad forces gained military victory and, with the claims of the 'Alids to the imamate speedily elbowed aside, the 'Abbāsids succeeded to the caliphate in 132/750 (see below, no. 3). In a general massacre of the defeated Umayyads, one of the few members of the family to survive was Hishām's grandson 'Abd al-Rahmān; he

escaped to North Africa and eventually founded in Spain a fresh, much longer-lived line of Umayyads (see below, no. 4).

Lane-Poole, 4–6, 9; Zambaur, 3 and Table F; Album, 7–11.

*EI*¹ 'Umayyads' (G. Levi Della Vida).

Veccia Vaglieri, 'The Patriarchal and Umayyad caliphates', in *The Cambridge History of Islam*, I, 57–103.

H. Kennedy, *The Prophet and the Age of the Caliphates. The Islamic Near East from the Sixth to the Eleventh Century*, 82–123, with genealogical table at p. 403.

G. R. Hawting, *The First Dynasty of Islam. The Umayyad Caliphate AD 661–750*, London 1986, with genealogical table at p. xv.

A. Noth, 'Früher Islam', in Haarmann (ed.), *Geschichte der arabischen Welt*, 11–100.

3

THE 'ABBASID CALIPHS 132-923/750-1517

1. The caliphs in Iraq and Baghdad 132-656/749-1258

- o 132/749 'Abdallāh b. Muḥammad al-Imām, Abu 'l-'Abbās al-Saffāh
- o 136/754 'Abdallāh b. Muḥammad al-Imām, Abū Ja'far al-Manṣūr
- o 158/775 Muḥammad b. al-Manṣūr, Abū 'Abdallāh al-Mahdī
- o 169/785 Mūsā b. al-Mahdī, Abū Muḥammad al-Hādī
- o 170/786 Hārūn b. al-Mahdī, Abū Ja'far al-Rashīd
- o 193/809 Muḥammad b. al-Rashīd, Abū Mūsā al-Amīn
- o 189/813 'Abdallāh b. al-Rashīd, Abū Ja'far al-Ma'mūn
- o 201-3/817-19 *Ibrāhīm b. al-Mahdī, in Baghdad, d. 224/839*
- o 218/833 Muḥammad b. al-Rashīd, Abū Ishāq al-Mu'tasim
- o 227/842 Hārūn b. al-Mu'tasim, Abū Ja'far al-Wāthiq
- o 232/847 Ja'far b. al-Mu'tasim, Abu 'l-Faḍl al-Mutawakkil
- o 247/861 Muḥammad b. al-Mutawakkil, Abū Ja'far al-Muntaṣir
- o 248/862 Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, Abu 'l-'Abbās al-Musta'in
- o 252/866 Muḥammad b. al-Mutawakkil, Abū 'Abdallāh al-Mu'tazz
- o 255/869 Muḥammad b. al-Wāthiq, Abū Ishāq al-Muhtadī
- o 256/870 Aḥmad b. al-Mutawakkil, Abu 'l-'Abbās al-Mu'tamid
- o 279/892 Aḥmad b. al-Muwaffaq, Abu 'l-'Abbās al-Mu'taḍid
- o 289/902 'Alī b. al-Mu'taḍid, Abū Muḥammad al-Muktafi
- 295/908 Ja'far b. al-Mu'taḍid, Abu 'l-Faḍl al-Muqtadir, first reign
- 296/908 *Ibn al-Mu'tazz al-Murtaḍā al-Muntaṣif, in Baghdad*
- o 296/908 Ja'far al-Muqtadir, second reign
- 317/929 Muḥammad b. al-Mu'taḍid, Abū Manṣūr al-Qāhir, first reign,
in Baghdad
- 317/929 Ja'far al-Muqtadir, third reign
- o 320/932 Muḥammad al-Qāhir, second reign, d. 339/950
- o 322/934 Aḥmad b. al-Muqtadir, Abu 'l-'Abbās al-Raḍī
- o 329/940 Ibrāhīm b. al-Muqtadir, Abū Ishāq al-Muttaqī, d. 357/968
- o 333/944 'Abdallāh b. al-Muktafi, Abu 'l-Qāsim al-Mustakfi, d. 338/
949
- o 334/946 al-Faḍl b. al-Muqtadir, Abu 'l-Qāsim al-Muṭī', d. 364/974
- o 363/974 'Abd al-Karīm b. al-Muṭī', Abu 'l-Faḍl al-Ṭā'i', d. 393/1003
- o 381/991 Aḥmad b. Ishāq, Abu 'l-'Abbās al-Qādir
- o 422/1031 'Abdallāh b. al-Qādir, Abū Ja'far al-Qā'im
- o 467/1075 'Abdallāh b. Muḥammad, Abu 'l-Qāsim al-Muqtadī
- o 487/1094 Aḥmad b. al-Muqtadī, Abu 'l-'Abbās al-Mustazhir
- o 512/1118 al-Faḍl b. al-Mustazhir, Abū Manṣūr al-Mustarshid
- o 529/1135 al-Manṣūr b. al-Mustarshid, Abū Ja'far al-Rashīd
- o 530/1136 Muḥammad b. al-Mustazhir, Abū 'Abdallāh al-Muqtafi
- o 555/1160 Yūsuf b. al-Muqtafi, Abu 'l-Muẓaffar al-Mustanjid
- o 566/1170 al-Hasan b. al-Mustanjid, Abū Muḥammad al-Mustaḍī'
- o 575/1180 Aḥmad b. al-Mustaḍī', Abu 'l-'Abbās al-Nāṣir

- o 622/1225 Muḥammad b. al-Nāṣir, Abū Naṣr al-Zāhir
- o 623/1226 al-Manṣūr b. al-Zāhir, Abū Ja'far al-Mustanṣir
- o 640–56/1242–58 'Abdallāh b. al-Mustanṣir, Abū Aḥmad al-Musta'ṣim
- o 656/1258 *Mongol sack of Baghdad*

2. The caliph in Aleppo, Ḥarrān and northern Syria 659–60/1261

- o 659–60/1261 Aḥmad b. al-Ḥasan, Abu 'l-'Abbās al-Ḥākim I
- 661/1262 *Transfer to Cairo*

3. The caliphs in Cairo 659–923/1261–1517

- 659–60/1261 Aḥmad b. al-Zāhir, Abu 'l-Qāsim al-Mustanṣir
- 661/1262 Aḥmad b. al-Ḥasan, Abu 'l-'Abbās al-Ḥākim I
- 701/1302 Sulaymān b. al-Ḥākim I, Abū Rabī'a al-Mustakfi I
- 740/1340 Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad al-Mustamsik, Abū Ishāq al-Wāthiq I
- 741/1341 Aḥmad b. al-Mustakfi I, Abu 'l-'Abbās al-Ḥākim II
- 753/1352 Abū Bakr b. al-Mustakfi I, Abu 'l-Fath al-Mu'tadid I
- 763/1362 Muḥammad b. al-Mu'tadid I, Abū 'Abdallāh al-Mutawakkil I, first reign
- 779/1377 Zakariyyā' b. al-Wāthiq I, Abū Yahyā al-Mu'taṣim, first reign
- 779/1377 Muḥammad al-Mutawakkil I, second reign
- 785/1383 'Umar b. al-Wāthiq I, Abū Ḥafṣ al-Wāthiq II
- 788/1386 Zakariyyā' al-Mu'taṣim, second reign
- 791/1389 Muḥammad al-Mutawakkil I, third reign
- 808/1406 'Abbās or Ya'qūb b. al-Mutawakkil I, Abu 'l-Faḍl al-Musta'in (also in 815/1412 proclaimed sultan, see below, no. 31, 2)
- 816/1414 Dāwūd b. al-Mutawakkil I, Abu 'l-Fath al-Mu'tadid II
- 845/1441 Sulaymān b. al-Mutawakkil I, Abū Rabī'a al-Mustakfi II
- 855/1451 Ḥamza b. al-Mutawakkil I, Abū Bakr al-Qā'im
- 859/1455 Yūsuf b. al-Mutawakkil I, Abu 'l-Maḥāsin al-Mustanjid
- 884/1479 'Abd al-'Azīz b. al-Musta'in, Abu 'l-'Izz al-Mutawakkil II
- 903/1497 Ya'qūb b. al-Mutawakkil II, Abu 'l-Ṣabr al-Mustamsik, first reign
- 914/1508 al-Mutawakkil III b. al-Mustamsik, first reign
- 922/1516 Ya'qūb al-Mustamsik, second reign
- 923/1517 al-Mutawakkil III, second reign, d. in Istanbul
- 923/1517 *Ottoman conquest of Egypt*

The 'Abbāsids acquired the caliphate through what might be considered from one aspect as a power-struggle between rival Meccan families, since they stemmed from the family of the Prophet's uncle al-'Abbās, of the Meccan clan of Ḥāshim; and because of this descent they were able to claim a legitimacy in the eyes of the orthodox Sunnī religious classes which the Umayyads had lacked. Even so, during the first century of their power the 'Abbāsids had to contend with frequent revolts of the 'Alids, descendants of the two sons of 'Alī, al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusayn, who were grandsons of Muḥammad and whom their partisans the Shī'a considered as having a better title to the caliphate and imamate, one based on a specific act of divinely-inspired designation by the Prophet. In self-defence, the apologists

of the 'Abbāsids stressed the superiority of descent through males over descent through females (since the 'Alid claim was through Muḥammad's daughter Fāṭima), and the caliphs themselves soon adopted a system of honorific titles (*alqāb*, sing. *laqab*) when they each ascended the throne, a practice unknown to their Umayyad predecessors; these titles proclaimed dependence on God and claimed divine support for 'Abbāsīd rule. The theocratic nature of the new dynasty's power was gradually emphasised in other ways, and the orthodox religious institution enlisted as far as possible on the side of the 'Abbāsids. Spreading into the sphere of practical government, there were also influences from the older Persian traditions of divine rulership and statecraft; for the 'Abbāsīd Revolution, while in origin an Arab movement, began on Persian soil and took advantage of certain Persian discontents. The shifting of the capital from Damascus in Syria to Iraq, eventually to Baghdad, symbolised the new eastward orientation of the caliphate, and over the next centuries Persian material and cultural practices and influences became increasingly evident within it.

The Islamic empire had virtually reached its full extent under the Umayyads, and, under the early 'Abbāsids, the borders of the *Dār al-Islām* were almost static. Only a few of the caliphs distinguished themselves as military commanders in the field – al-Ma'mūn and al-Mu'taṣim led successful expeditions into Anatolia against the Byzantines – and in the tenth and early eleventh centuries it was the Muslims who were forced on to the defensive by the vigorous Greek emperors of the Macedonian dynasty. Already in the ninth century, the political unity of the caliphate began to dissolve. A branch of the Umayyads, *a priori* hostile to the 'Abbāsids, ruled in Spain (see below, no. 4), and North Africa was in general too distant to be controlled properly. Such lines of governors as the Tulūnids in Egypt (see below, no. 25) and the Ṭahirids and Sājids in Persia (see below, nos 82, 70) still behaved as faithful vassals of Baghdad, but their existence nevertheless paved the way for largely autonomous dynasties on the far eastern fringes of the Persian world, like the Sāmānids of Transoxania and the Šaffārīds of Sistan (see below, nos 83, 84), who forwarded taxation to Baghdad only rarely or not at all. The effective authority of the 'Abbāsids became reduced to central Iraq, above all, in the tenth century, when an aggressive political Shī'ism triumphed temporarily over a large part of the central and eastern lands of the caliphate. The Fāṭimids seized first North Africa and then Egypt and southern Syria (see below, no. 27), setting themselves up in Cairo as rival caliphs. In Iraq and western Persia, the Daylamī Būyids rose to power (see below, no. 75), entering Baghdad in 334/945 and reducing the 'Abbāsids to the status of puppets, with almost nothing left save their moral and spiritual influence as heads of Sunnī Islam.

The situation was saved for the 'Abbāsids and for Sunnī orthodoxy in general by the appearance in the Middle East in the eleventh century of the Turkish Seljuqs (see below, no. 91), but the Seljuqs, while upholders of the Sunna from the religious point of view, did not intend to let the political power of the caliphs revive to the detriment of the sultanate which they had just established. It was only in the twelfth century, when the family solidarity of the Great Seljuqs was impaired and their authority thereby enfeebled, that the fortunes of the 'Abbāsids began to rise under such vigorous caliphs as al-Muqtafi and al-Nāṣir. This

recovery in the effective power and moral influence was, however, cut short by the Mongol cataclysm, and in 656/1258 Hülegü's Mongol troops murdered the last 'Abbāsid caliph to rule in Baghdad (see below, no. 133).

The first three centuries of 'Abbāsid rule (eighth to eleventh centuries AD) saw the full flowering of mediaeval Islamic civilisation. Literature, theology, philosophy and the natural sciences all flourished, with fertilising influences coming in from Persia and the Hellenistic and Byzantine cultures. Economic and commercial progress was widespread, above all in the older, long-settled lands of Persia, the Fertile Crescent and Egypt, and trade links were established with outside regions like the Eurasian steppes, the Far East, India and black Africa. Despite political breakdown at the centre and tribal and sectarian violence during the tenth and eleventh centuries, this progress in the material and cultural fields continued, and it was in this regard apt for the Swiss orientalist Adam Mez to designate the tenth century that of the 'Renaissance of Islam'. Within the northern tier of the Middle East, incoming Turkmen nomads and subsequently-established Turkish dynasties brought extensive changes in such spheres as land utilisation and economic life, but were largely absorbed into the cultural and religious fabric of Islam; it was the Mongols, for several decades fierce enemies of Islam and bringers of a steppe way of life alien to the settled agricultural economies of the Middle East, who dealt more serious blows to the economic and social stability of Iraq and the Persian lands.

The Baghdad caliphate was thus extinguished by the Mongols, but soon afterwards the Mamlūk sultan of Egypt, Baybars (see below, no. 31, 1), himself decided to install a caliph, and invited Aḥmad al-Mustanşir, an ostensible uncle of the last 'Abbāsid of Baghdad, who had been held prisoner there but had been then released by the Mongols, to Cairo (659/1261). This caliph led an army in an unsuccessful bid to reconquer Baghdad, possibly dying in the attempt and certainly disappearing from further mention. Meanwhile, a further 'Abbāsid, who seems genuinely to have been a descendant of al-Mustarshid, had in this same year been proclaimed caliph at Aleppo, with the backing of the Amīr Aq-qush, as al-Hākīm, subsequently installed in Cairo in 661/1262. The establishment of a caliph in Cairo served to legitimise Mamlūk rule and to increase Mamluk prestige in places as far apart as North Africa and Muslim India, and it was a moral weapon in the warfare against the Crusaders and the Mongols; furthermore the caliphs continued, as they had done in late 'Abbāsid Baghdad, to act as heads of the *Futuwwa* or chivalric orders. But they had no practical power in the Mamlūk state, and there was certainly no idea of a division of power with the sultans. The last caliph, al-Mutawakkil III, was carried off to Istanbul in 923/1517 by the Ottoman conqueror Selīm the Grim, but the story that he then transferred his rights in the caliphate to the Turkish sultans is a piece of fiction originating in the nineteenth century.

The advent of the 'Abbāsids in 132/749 saw a general elevation of the ruler's status and a formalising of the court ceremonial surrounding him, possibly as a reflection of the increased permeation of Persian cultural influences into 'Abbāsid society mentioned above. Whereas the Umayyad caliphs had been content with their simple names as ruling designations, from the accession of al-Manşūr onwards, the 'Abbāsid caliphs adopted honorific titles expressing divine support for their rule, for example al-Mahdī 'the divinely-guided one' or emphasising the

ruler's leading role in implementing God's plan for His world, for example al-Qā'im 'he who arises, undertakes [something]' or al-Zāhir 'he who makes prevail', usually with a complement such as *li-dīn Allāh* 'to/for God's religion' or *bi-amr Allāh* 'in the furtherance of God's affair/command'. Once the unity of the caliphate began to dissolve and provincial dynasties arose, lesser, local rulers began to emulate the caliphs and adorn themselves with high-flown, sonorous titles of this type, not infrequently ludicrously at variance with the actual significance of the bearers of them.

Lane-Poole, 6–8, 12–13; Zambaur, 4–5 and Table G; Album, 11–13.

El² 'Abbāsids' (B. Lewis).

D. and J. Sourdel, *La civilisation de l'Islam classique*, Paris 1968, chs 2 and 3, 61–126.

D. Sourdel, 'The 'Abbāsīd caliphate', in *The Cambridge History of Islam*, I, 104–39.

H. Kennedy, *The Early Abbasid Caliphate: A Political History*, London 1981.

idem, *The Prophet and the Age of the Caliphs. The Islamic Near East from the Sixth to the Eleventh Century*, 124–99, with genealogical table at p. 404.

T. Nagel, 'Das Kalifat der Abbasiden', in Haarmann (ed.), *Geschichte der arabischen Welt*, 101–65.

P. M. Holt, 'Some observations on the 'Abbāsīd caliphate of Cairo', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental [and African] Studies*, 47 (1984), 501–7.

S. Heidemann, *Das Aleppiner Kalifat (A.D. 1261). Vom Ende des Kalifates in Bagdad über Aleppo zu den Restaurationen in Kairo*, Leiden 1994.

TEN

The Eastern Persian Lands, Transoxania and Khwārazm before the Seljuqs

82

THE TĀHIRIDS AND MUṢ'ABIDS

205–78/821–91

Governors in Khurasan (Khurāsān) and in Baghdad and Iraq

1. The governors in Khurasan and its administrative dependencies

205–59/821–73

- o 205/821 Tāhir I b. al-Ḥusayn b. Muṣ'ab b. Ruzayq al-Khuzā'i, Abu 'l-Tayyib Dhu 'l-Yamīnayn
- o 207/822 Talḥa b. Tāhir I
- o 213/828 'Abdallāh b. Tāhir I, Abu 'l-'Abbās
- o 230/845 Tāhir II b. 'Abdallāh
- o 248–59/862–73 Muḥammad b. Tāhir II
- 259/873 *Šaffārid occupation of Nishapur (Nishāpūr)*
- (259–67, 268–/
- 873–81, 882– Muḥammad b. Tāhir II nominal governor of Khurasan)
- (263/876 al-Ḥusayn b. Tāhir II, temporarily restored in Nishapur)
- 261–/875– *Khurasan disputed by the Šaffārids and various military adventurers*

2. The military governors (*Aṣḥāb al-Shurṭa*) in Baghdad and Iraq

207–78/822–91

- 205/820 Tāhir I b. al-Ḥusayn b. Muṣ'ab
- 207/822 Ishāq b. Ibrāhīm b. Muṣ'ab
- 235/849 Muḥammad b. Ishāq
- 236/850 'Abdallāh b. Ishāq
- 237/851 Muḥammad b. 'Abdallāh b. Tāhir I
- 253/867 'Ubaydallāh b. 'Abdallāh b. Tāhir I, first governorship
- 255/869 Sulaymān b. 'Abdallāh b. Tāhir I
- 266/879 'Ubaydallāh b. 'Abdallāh, second governorship
- 271/884 Muḥammad b. Tāhir II
- 276–8/890–1 'Ubaydallāh b. 'Abdallāh, third governorship
- 278/891 *The Turkish slave commanders Badr al-Mu'taḍidī and Mu'nīs al-Khādim*
- c. 297/c. 910 Muḥammad b. 'Ubaydallāh, deputy *Šāhib al-Shurṭa* for Mu'nīs

Ṭāhir b. al-Husayn was probably of Persian *mawlā* or client origin, though eulogists of the Ṭāhirids endeavoured to give them a direct lineage from the aristocratic Arab tribe of Khuẓā'a. Ṭāhir rose to favour under al-Ma'mūn as commander of the latter's forces in the fratricidal war against al-Amīn in 194/810, and after the fall of Baghdad became governor of that city and of Jazīra. Finally, he was appointed governor of the East. Just before his death shortly afterwards, he had started to omit al-Ma'mūn's name from the Friday *khutba* or sermon, this being tantamount to a renunciation of allegiance or declaration of independence. Nevertheless, the caliph handed on the governorship to his son Ṭalḥa, being unable to find anyone more reliable for this important office. Henceforth, the Ṭāhirids ruled from Nishapur as a hereditary line of governors but remained faithful vassals of the 'Abbāsids, continuing to forward tribute regularly to Iraq (the Turkish military slaves in this tribute became one of the mainstays of the caliphs' professional armies), although 'Abdallāh b. Ṭāhir was careful never to leave Khurasan for Baghdad. Hence the Ṭāhirids may be considered as a virtually autonomous line of governors but not as a separate, independent dynasty, as were their rivals the Ṣaffārīds. The family's strong Sunnī orthodoxy and their favour towards the established Arab and Persian landed and military classes assured them of top-level support, while they also had a reputation for protecting the interests of the masses, of encouraging agriculture and irrigation, and of patronising scholars and poets.

In Khurasan, the main political and military efforts of the Ṭāhirids were first aimed at suppressing rebels like the Qārinid Māzyār (see above, no. 80) and keeping in check, also in the Caspian provinces, the Zaydī Shī'īs; but latterly, their position was threatened by the rising power of the Ṣaffārīds in Sistan (Sīstān) (see below, no. 84, 1), an administrative dependency of Khurasan, and this they failed to withstand. Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir II lost Nishapur to Ya'qūb b. al-Layth in 259/873, and eventually escaped to Iraq. The caliph reappointed him to the governorship of Khurasan, but he was never able to take this up, and for the next twenty years the province was disputed by the Ṣaffārīds and several local commanders.

Khurasan was, however, only one of the governorships held by the house of Muṣ'ab b. Ruzayq, for other members functioned as military governors in Baghdad and Iraq until the end of the ninth century, a longer tenure of office than their kinsmen in Khurasan. After Ṭāhir I left for the East, his command in Baghdad was at first given to the parallel branch of the Muṣ'abids, but then after 237/851 the descendants of Ṭāhir I took over. The Ṭāhirids' position in Baghdad was based on their great wealth and estates there, in particular, their *Harīm*, a complex of buildings and markets to the north of al-Manṣūr's Round City. The governors in Baghdad were renowned as patrons of Arabic culture, and some of them, like 'Ubaydallāh b. 'Abdallāh, themselves enjoyed contemporary reputations as *littérateurs*.

Justi, 436; Lane-Poole, 128; Sachau, 19–20 no. 39; Zambaur, 197–8; Album, 32.

cf. 'Ṭāhirids' (W. Barthold).

Sa'id Nafīsī, *Ta'rikh-i khāndān-i Ṭāhirī*. I. Ṭāhir b. Husayn, Tehran 1335/1956, with a genealogical table at the end.

C. E. Bosworth, 'The Ṭāhirids and Ṣaffārīds', in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, IV, 90–106, 114–15.

Mongi Kaabi, *Les Ṭāhirides au Ḥurāsān et en Iraq (III^{ième} H./IX^{ième} J.C.)*, 2 vols, Tunis 1983, with a genealogical table at I, 409.

THE SĀMĀNIDS
204–395/819–1005
Transoxania and Khurasan

- 204/819 Aḥmad I b. Asad b. Sāmān Khudā, originally governor of Farghāna and then of Soghdia
- 250/864 Naṣr I b. Aḥmad I, ruler in Samarkand
- 279/892 Ismā'il b. Aḥmad I, Abū Ibrāhīm al-Amīr al-Maḍī
- 295/907 Aḥmad II b. Ismā'il, Abū Naṣr al-Amīr al-Shahīd
- 301/914 Naṣr II b. Aḥmad II, al-Amīr al-Sa'id
- 331/943 Nūḥ I b. Naṣr II, al-Amīr al-Ḥamīd
- 343/954 'Abd al-Malik I b. Nūḥ I, Abū 'l-Fawāris al-Amīr al-Mu'ayyad or al-Muwaffaq
- 350/961 Maṣṣūr I b. Nūḥ I, Abū Ṣāliḥ al-Amīr al-Saḍīd
- 365/976 Nūḥ II b. Maṣṣūr I, al-Amīr al-Raḍī
- 387/997 Maṣṣūr II b. Nūḥ II, Abū 'l-Ḥārith
- 389/999 'Abd al-Malik II b. Nūḥ II, Abū 'l-Fawāris
- 390-5/1000-5 Ismā'il II b. Nūḥ II, Abū Ibrāhīm al-Muntaṣir
- 395/1005 *Definitive division of the Sāmānid territories between the Qarakhanids and the Ghaznawids*

The founder of the Sāmānid line was one Sāmān Khudā, a *dihqān* or local landowner in the Balkh district of what is now northern Afghanistan, although the dynasty later claimed descent from the pre-Islamic Sāsānid emperors of Persia. Sāmān Khudā became a Muslim, and his four grandsons served the 'Abbāsīd caliph al-Ma'mūn as sub-governors for the Ṭāhirids of Khurasan (see above, no. 82, 1): Nūḥ was appointed governor of Samarkand (Samarqand), Aḥmad of Farghāna, Yaḥyā of Shāsh (the later Tashkent) and Ilyās of Herat (Harāt). The branch south of the Oxus did not prosper, but the others acquired a good foothold in Transoxania so that in 263/875 Naṣr b. Aḥmad received from al-Mu'tamid the governorship of that complete province. This rich region became the core of the Sāmānids' empire, and they took over also the duties of defending Transoxania's territorial integrity and its commercial interests from attack by the pagan Turks of the steppes. The northern fringes of Transoxania and Farghāna were definitely secured for Islam, and expeditions mounted into the steppes against the Qarluq and other Turkish tribes. By making their military might feared within the steppes and by keeping caravan routes across Inner Asia open, the Sāmānids assured the economic well-being of their lands; it was through their agency that many of the Turkish slaves, employed from the ninth century onwards very extensively in the armies of Muslim princes of the central and eastern lands, were imported. Backed by this prosperity, the amīrs made their court at Bukhara not only a centre of Arabic learning but also of the renaissance of New Persian language and literature, and it was under Sāmānid rule that Firdawsī began his poetic version of the Persian national epic, the *Shāh-nāma*.

In 287/900, Ismā'il b. Aḥmad earned the caliph's gratitude by defeating and

capturing the Ṣaffārid 'Amr b. al-Layth (see below, no. 84, 1), and was rewarded with the governorship of Khurasan in succession to the Tāhirids and Ṣaffārids. The Sāmānids were now the greatest power in the east, strong proponents of Sunnī orthodoxy there, and exercising suzerainty over outlying regions like Khwārazm, the upper Oxus lands and Sistan, while in northern Persia they were rivals of the Būyids (see above, no. 75). But in the middle years of the tenth century, ominous signs of instability appeared in the Sāmānid state. A series of palace revolutions showed that the military classes, opposed to the amīrs' policies of centralisation, were gaining control, while revolts in Khurasan abstracted that province from the direct authority of Bukhara. It was therefore not difficult for the Turkish Qarakhanids and Ghaznawids (see below, nos 90, 158) to take over the Sāmānid territories, and the last fugitive Sāmānid, Ismā'il al-Muntaṣir, was killed in 395/1005. The downfall of the dynasty meant that all the hitherto Iranian lands north of the Oxus passed under Turkish control, and there now began there a process of ethnic and linguistic Turkification, substantially completed – except in what is now the Tajikistan Republic and to a lesser extent in Uzbekistan – by modern times.

Justi, 440; Lane-Poole, 131–3; Zambaur, 202–3; Album, 33.

*Et*² 'Sāmānids' (C. E. Bosworth).

W. Barthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion*, 3rd edn, London 1968.

R. N. Frye, 'The Sāmānids', in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, IV, 136–61.

W. L. Treadwell, *The Political History of the Sāmānid State*, D.Phil. thesis, Oxford 1991, unpubl.

THE ŠAFFĀRIDS

247–393/861–1003

*Centre of their power in Sistan, with an empire extending at times
into Persia and eastern Afghanistan*

1. The Laythid branch

- o 247/861 Ya'qūb b. al-Layth al-Šaffār, Abū Yūsuf
- o 265/879 'Amr b. al-Layth, Abū Ḥafs
- o (261–8/875–82) *Aḥmad b. 'Abdallāh Khuḡistānī, Abū Shujā', rebel in Nishapur)*
- o (268–83/882–96) *Rāfi' b. Harthama, rebel and caliphal governor in Nishapur and then Rayy)*
- o 287/900 Ṭāhir b. Muḥammad b. 'Amr, Abu 'l-Ḥasan, with his brother Ya'qūb, Abū Yūsuf
- o 296/909 al-Layth b. 'Alī b. al-Layth
- 298/910 Muḥammad b. 'Alī
- o 298/910 al-Mu'addal b. 'Alī
- 298/911 *First Sāmānid occupation of Sīstān*
- 299/912 *Revolt of o Muḥammad b. Hurmuz*
- 299–300 'Amr b. Ya'qūb b. Muḥammad b. 'Amr, Abū Ḥafs
- 300–1/912–14 *Second Sāmānid occupation*
- 301–11/914–23 *Seizure of power by the local commanders Aḥmad Niyā, Kuthayyir b. Aḥmad, o Aḥmad b. Qudām and o 'Abdallāh b. Aḥmad*

2. The Khalafid branch

- o 311/923 Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Khalaf, Abū Ja'far
- o 352–93/963–1003 Khalaf b. Aḥmad, Abū Aḥmad Walī 'l-Dawla, d. 309/1009
- o (352–8/963–9) Ṭāhir b. Muḥammad, Abu 'l-Ḥusayn, descendant of 'Alī b. al-Layth, regent for Khalaf, d. 359/970)
- o (359–73/970–83) *Husayn b. Ṭāhir Tamīmī, rebel)*
- 393/1003 *Ghaznawid occupation*

The Šaffārid brothers derived their name from their founder Ya'qūb's trade of coppersmith (*šaffār*). Under Ya'qūb and 'Amr, their native province of Sistan became the centre of a vast but transient empire which covered almost all Persia except for the north-west and the Caspian region and which stretched to the frontiers of India. In the ninth century, Sistan was much disturbed by social and sectarian unrest; it had long been a refuge area for various malcontents and schismatics fleeing eastwards through Persia, including the Khārijīs, defeated and dispersed by the Umayyad governors. It may be that Ya'qūb had been a Khārijī himself; the nucleus of his forces lay in the bands of local vigilantes defending the cause of Sunnī orthodoxy in Sistan, but his troops came to include many former Khārijīs also. With this army, Ya'qūb expanded eastwards to Kabul (Kābul), then

a pagan region on the fringe of the Indian world, and overturned the native dynasty there. In the west, he attacked the Tāhirids (see above, no. 82) in 259/873, wresting from them their capital Nishapur and ending their governorship over Khurasan. He was bold enough to invade Iraq and mount an attack on the heart of the caliphate itself, but this was halted on the banks of the Tigris in 262/876.

Whereas the Tāhirids and Sāmānids (see above, nos 82, 83) represented the interests of religious orthodoxy and the social *status quo*, the Šaffārid chiefs were plebeian in origin and proud of it, and they openly proclaimed their contempt for the 'Abbāsids. Thus they effectively demolished the 'caliphal fiction' whereby provincial governors and rulers derived legitimacy for their authority from an ostensible act of delegation by the head of the Islamic community. 'Amr b. al-Layth was recognised by the 'Abbāsid ruler as his governor in several Persian provinces and, eventually, in Khurasan. However, not content with these extensive territories, 'Amr coveted Transoxania also, which had been nominally under Tāhirid oversight. But the actual holders of power there, the Sāmānids, proved more than a match for the Šaffārids; 'Amr overreached himself and was disastrously defeated. Being a personal creation of military conquerors, the Šaffārid empire lost its Khurasanian provinces, and in the early tenth century, after a series of weaker, ephemeral amīrs, passed temporarily under Sāmānid control.

Despite this severe check, the Šaffārids were to revive, and it is clear that they to some extent represented the interests and aspirations of the people of Sistan from whom they had sprung. From 311/923, the Šaffārids reappear as local rulers in Sistan and adjacent regions. The two amīrs of this line, from a collateral branch of the family, achieved widespread reputations as Maecenases and, in the case of Khalaf b. Aḥmad, as a scholar in his own right. In 393/1003, the aggressive and expansionist Maḥmūd of Ghazna (see below, no. 158) incorporated Sistan into his empire, an event which the patriotic anonymous author of a local history, the *Ta'rikh-i Sīstān*, regards as a disaster for the land.

It should be noted that the convenient division of the Šaffārids into 'Laythids' and 'Khalafids' corresponds to the 'first line' and 'second line' in Zambaur's listing of the Šaffārids, but that his third and fourth lines have no demonstrable connection with the Šaffārid ruling house; for these, the so-called Maliks of Nīmrūz, see below, no. 106.

Justi, 439; Lane-Poole, 129–30 (ignores all but the very first Šaffārids); Sachau, 11 no. 16; Zambaur, 199–201 (see the remarks above); Album, 32.

Er² 'Šaffārids' (C. E. Bosworth).

Milton Gold (tr.), *The Tārikh-e Sīstān*, Rome 1976.

C. E. Bosworth, 'The Tāhirids and Šaffārids', in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, IV, 106–35.

idem, *The History of the Saffarids of Sistan and the Maliks of Nimruz (247/861 to 949/1542–3)*, Costa Mesa CA and New York 1994, 67–361, with genealogical tables at pp. xxiii–xxiv.

85

THE BĀNĪJŪRIDS OR ABŪ DĀWŪDIDS c. 233–c. 295/c. 848–c. 908 *Balkh and Tūkhāristān*

- ? Hashim b. Bānījūr, in Khuttal, d. 243/857
- o 233/848 Dāwūd b. al-‘Abbās b. Hashim, in Balkh, d. 259/873
- o 260/874 Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Bānījūr, Abū Dāwūd, previously governor of Andarāba and Panjhīr, still ruling in 285/898 or 286/899
- o ? Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, in Balkh and Andarāba until c. 295/c. 908

The Bānījūrids were a line of local rulers, vassals of the Sāmānids (see above, no. 83), who ruled at Balkh and Andarāba in the region of Tūkhāristān to the south of the middle Oxus, and generally also at Panjhīr in the Hindu Kush, famed for its silver mines. They were most probably of Iranian origin. Their ancestor Bānījūr, a contemporary of the first ‘Abbāsīd caliphs, had connections with Farghāna, but both the affiliations and the chronology of his line are extremely obscure. From the early tenth century, other local chiefs seem to have controlled Tūkhāristān, but it is possible that a line of local princes to the north of the Middle Oxus, in Khuttal, were kinsmen of the Bānījūrids.

Zambaur, 202, 204; Album, 33.

*El*² Suppl. ‘Bānījūrīds’ (C. E. Bosworth).

R. Vasmer, ‘Beiträge zur muhammedanischen Münzkunde. I. Die Münzen der Abū Dā‘udiden’, *NZ*, N.F. 18 (1925), 49–62.

Muḥammad Abū-l-Faraj ‘Ush, ‘Dirhams Abu Dāwūdides (Banū Bānījūrī)’, *Revue Numismatique*, 6th series, 15 (1973), 169–76.

THE SĪMJŪRIDS
300–92/913–1002

Governors in Khurasan and feudatories in Quhistān

- 300-1/913-14 Sīmjūr al-Dawātī, Abū 'Imrān, governor for the Sāmānids in Sistan, d. between 318/930 and 324/936
 310-14/922-6 Ibrāhīm b. Sīmjūr, Abū 'Alī, first governorship in Khurasan
 333-4/945-6 Ibrāhīm b. Sīmjūr, second governorship, d. 336/948
 345-9/956-60 Muḥammad I b. Ibrāhīm, Abū 'l-Ḥasan, first governorship in Khurasan
 350-71/961-82 Muḥammad I b. Ibrāhīm, second governorship, d. 378/989
 o 374-7/984-7 Muḥammad II b. Muḥammad I, Abū 'Alī al-Muzaffar 'Imād al-Dawla, Amīr al-Umarā', al-Mu'ayyad min al-Samā', first governorship in Khurasan
 385/995 Muḥammad II, second governorship, d. 387/997
 ? 'Alī b. Muḥammad I, Abū 'l-Qāsim, commander in Khurasan until 392/1002, d. at some point thereafter

The Sīmjūrids began as Turkish military slaves of the Sāmānids (see above, no. 83), Sīmjūr being the ceremonial ink-stand bearer (*dawātī*) of Ismā'īl b. Aḥmad. He rose to prominence when the Sāmānids temporarily drove out the Ṣaffārids (see above, no. 84) and occupied Sistan. Thereafter, the family were prominent throughout the tenth century in the warfare of the Sāmānids with their enemies in northern and eastern Persia, often as governors in Khurasan and with a territorial base in their Quhistān estates, and were finally involved in the chaos there as the Sāmānid amirate broke up, after which the family largely drops out of mention.

Sachau, 11 no. 15; Zambaur, 205.

*EP*² 'Sīmdjūrīds' (C. E. Bosworth).

Erdoğan Merçil, *Sīmcūriler*, n.p. n.d. = a series of articles in *Tarih Dergisi*, no. 32 (1979), 71–88; *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi*, nos 10–11 (1979–80), 91–6; *Tarih Dergisi*, no. 33 (1980–1), 115–32; *Belleten*, 49, no. 195 (1985), 547; and *Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi*, no. 13 (1989), 123–38, with a genealogical table at p. 138.

87

THE ILYĀSIDS 320-57/932-68 *Kirman*

320-2/932-4 Muḥammad b. Ilyās, Abū 'Alī, governor for the Sāmānids, first
tenure of power

322/934 *Expulsion by Mākān b. Kākī*

324/936 Muḥammad b. Ilyās, second tenure of power, abdicated 356/967

356-7/967-8 Ilyasa' b. Muḥammad

357/968 *Būyid conquest of Kirman*

Muḥammad b. Ilyās was a commander, of Soghdian origin, in the service of the Sāmānid Naṣr II b. Aḥmad (see above, no. 83), who, after the failure of the rebellion of the Amīr's brothers at Bukhara in 317/929, eventually withdrew southwards to Kirman, where there was something of a power vacuum after the waning of 'Abbāsid control in southern Persia. There he successfully established himself, fighting off the Daylamī commander Mākān and acting nominally as governor for the Sāmānids but in practice independent. He was compelled by his sons to abdicate after a reign of thirty-six years, but it was at this point that the powerful Būyid Amīr 'Aḍud al-Dawla turned his attention to Kirman, and this proved fatal for the short-lived line of the Ilyāsids, with Ilyasa' driven out to Transoxania. Various Ilyāsids attempted revanches, but Kirman was to remain generally under Būyid control until the advent of the Seljuqs (see below, no. 91, 3).

Sachau, 10-11 no. 14; Zambaur, 216.

*Et*² 'Ilyāsids' (C. E. Bosworth).

C. E. Bosworth, 'The Banū Ilyās of Kirmān (320-57/932-68)', in idem (ed.), *Iran and Islam, in memory of the late Vladimir Minorsky*, 107-24.

THE MUHTAJIDS

321-43/933-54

Governors in Khurasan and Amīrs of Chaghāniyān

- 321/933 Muḥammad b. al-Muẓaffar b. Muḥtāj, Abū Bakr,
governor in Khurasan, d. 329/941
- o 327/939 Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, Abū 'Alī, first
governorship in Khurasan
- 333/945 *Governorship of Ibrāhīm b. Sīmjūr*
- 335/946 Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, second governorship
- 335/947 *Governorship of Maṣṣūr b. Qaratigin*
- 340-3/952-4 Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, third
governorship, d. 344/955
- late fourth/tenth Muḥammad b. ?, Abu 'l-Muẓaffar Fakhr
and early fifth/eleventh al-Dawla, Amīr of Chaghāniyān, ? a Muḥtājīd
centuries

The Muḥtāj family were hereditary lords of the principality of Chaghāniyān on the north bank of the middle Oxus, but whether they were descendants of the indigenous, presumably Iranian, Chaghān Khudās from the time of the Arab invasions, or possibly Persianised Arabs, is unknown. They appear as commanders for the Sāmānids, and then as governors and commanders-in-chief in Khurasan for the Amīrs, in the second quarter of the tenth century. Abū 'Alī Aḥmad was a dominant figure there, but eventually died in exile. It seems, however, that the Muḥtājids retained their local base in Chaghāniyān, possibly into the eleventh century, since local princes there are mentioned, although their affiliation to the original line is uncertain.

Zambaur, 204; Album, 33.

EF² 'Muḥtājids' (C. E. Bosworth); EII 'Āl-e Moḥtāj' (Bosworth).

C. E. Bosworth, 'The rulers of Chaghāniyān in early Islamic times', *Iran, JBIPS*, 19 (1981), 1-20.

Pre-Islamic times to the seventh/thirteenth century
Khwārazm

1. The Afrīghids of Kāth (pre-Islamic times to 385/995)

Sixteen Shāhs are listed by al-Bīrūnī, the tenth, Arthamūkh b. Būzkār, being allegedly a contemporary of the Prophet Muḥammad. The first Shāh with an Islamic name is the seventeenth:

‘Abdallāh b. T.r.k.s.bātha, ? early third/ninth century

Manṣūr b. ‘Abdallāh

‘Irāq b. Manṣūr, reigning in 285/898

Muḥammad b. ‘Irāq, reigning in 309/921

‘Abdallāh b. Ashkam, not listed by al-Bīrūnī but ruling c. 332/c. 944

o Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, Abū Sa‘īd, ruling in 356/967

o Muḥammad b. Aḥmad, Abū ‘Abdallāh, d. 385/995

Ma’mūnid conquest

2. The Ma’mūnids of Gurgānj (385–408/995–1017)

385/995 Ma’mūn I b. Muḥammad, Abū ‘Alī

o 387/997 ‘Alī b. Ma’mūn I, Abū ‘l-Ḥasan

399/1009 Ma’mūn II b. Ma’mūn I, Abū ‘l-‘Abbās

407–8/1017 Muḥammad b. ‘Alī, Abū ‘l-Ḥārith

408/1017 *Ghaznawid conquest*

3. The Ghaznawid governors with the title of Khwārazm Shāh
 (408–32/1017–41)

408/1017 Altuntash Ḥājib, Ghaznawid commander

423/1032 Ḥārūn b. Altuntash, lieutenant of the nominal Khwārazm Shāh, Sa‘īd b. Mas‘ūd of Ghazna, later independent of Ghazna, probably then himself assuming the title Khwārazm Shāh

425/1034 Ismā‘īl b. Khāndān b. Altuntash, independent of Ghazna, styling himself Khwārazm Shāh

432/1041 *Conquest of Khwārazm by the Oghuz Yabghu, Shāh Malik b. ‘Alī, Abū ‘l-Fawāris, of Jand, probably receiving the title Khwārazm Shāh from Mas‘ūd of Ghazna*

4. The line of Anūshtigin Shihna, originally as governors for the Seljuqs with the title of Khwārazm Shāh, from towards the mid-twelfth century often in practice largely independent rulers in Khwārazm and, at times, in Transoxania and Persia (c. 470–628/c. 1077–1231)

c. 470/c. 1077 *Anūshtigin Gharcha’ī, nominal Khwārazm Shāh*

- 490/1097 *Ekinchi b. Qochqar, Turkish governor with the title Khwārazm Shāh*
- 490/1097 *Arslan Tigin Muḥammad b. Anūshtigin, Abu 'l-Faṭḥ, Quṭb al-Dīn, Khwārazm Shāh*
- o 521/1127 *Qizil Arslan Atsiz b. Muḥammad, Abu 'l-Muẓaffar 'Alā' al-Dīn*
- o 551/1156 *Il Arslan b. Atsiz, Abu 'l-Faṭḥ*
- o 567/1172 *Tekish b. Il Arslan, Abu 'l-Muẓaffar Tāj al-Dunyā wa 'l-Dīn*
- o 567–89/1172–93 *Mahmūd b. Il Arslan, Abu 'l-Qāsim Sulṭān Shāh, Jalāl al-Dunyā wa 'l-Dīn, rival ruler in northern Khurasan, d. 589/1193*
- o 596/1200 *Muḥammad b. Tekish, 'Alā' al-Dīn*
- o 617–28/1220–31 *Mengüberti (one of the usual renderings of this cryptic Turkish name; a further possibility suggested recently by Dr Peter Jackson is Mingīrinī 'having a thousand men' = the familiar Persian name Hazārmard) b. Muḥammad, Jalāl al-Dīn*
- Mongol conquest of Transoxania and Persia*

Khwārazm, the classical Chorasnia, was the well-irrigated, rich agricultural region on the lower Oxus, in later times the Khanate of Khiva. Surrounded as it was on all sides by steppeland and desert, it was isolated geographically, and this isolation long enabled it to maintain a separate political existence and a distinctive Iranian language and culture. Khwārazm may well have been an early home of the Iranians; certainly, the local historian and antiquary al-Bīrūnī (d. 440/1048) traced the beginnings of political life there beyond the first millennium BC. He placed the beginning of the Iranian Afrīghid dynasty in c. AD 305, and listed twenty-two Shāhs of this line down to its extinction in 385/995. Khwārazm first came into the purview of Islamic history in 93/712, when the Arab governor of Khurasan, Qutayba b. Muslim, invaded Khwārazm and wrought considerable destruction, it is reported, to the indigenous civilisation there. It thus came vaguely under Muslim suzerainty, but it was not until the end of the eighth century or the beginning of the ninth century that an Afrīghid was first converted to the new faith, appearing with the traditional convert's name of 'Abdallāh. The Islamic names of subsequent Shāhs are henceforth attested, though not their exact chronology, since al-Bīrūnī provides no dates.

In the course of the tenth century, the city of Gurgānj on the left bank of the Oxus grew in economic and political importance, largely because of its position as the terminus for the caravan trade across the steppes to the Volga and Russia. A local family, the Ma'mūnids, in 385/995 violently overthrew the Afrīghids of Kāth (which lay on the right bank of the river), and themselves assumed the traditional title of Khwārazm Shāh. The rule of the Ma'mūnids was brief but quite glorious; great scholars like the philosopher and scientist Ibn Sīnā (Avicenna) and the littérateur al-Tha'alībī flourished under their patronage. Khwārazm had been theoretically under Sāmānid suzerainty, although in practice this had meant little; but in 408/1017, Mahmūd of Ghazna, heir to the Sāmānids' power in Khurasan, resolved to add Khwārazm to his empire, and Ma'mūnid rule was

ended there. For the next decade or so, the province was governed by Ghaznawid military commanders, and then fell into the hands of Shāh Malik, the Oghuz Turkish Yabghu or ruler of Jand at the mouth of the Syr Darya. However, very soon, in 432/1041, Shāh Malik was overthrown by his rivals from the Seljuq family of the Oghuz (see below, no. 91, 1), and soon afterwards Khwārazm passed under Seljuq control.

The Great Seljuq sultans appointed their own governors to Khwārazm, and in Malik Shāh's reign his Turkish slave commander Anūshtigin Gharcha'i, who was keeper of the royal washing-bowls (*tasht-dār*) received the nominal title of Khwārazm Shāh, although he never seems to have gone there. His successors, however, became hereditary governors in Khwārazm, with the practical title of Shāh; this line of Anūshtigin was strongly Turkish in ethos, seen by the prevalence among them of Turkish names, and close connections, including by means of marriage alliances, were kept up with the Inner Asian steppes. Anūshtigin's grandson Atsīz, while remaining nominally a vassal of the sultans, had ambitions of striking out on a more independent policy. This became possible after Sanjar's disastrous defeat of 535/1141 by the Qara Khitay (see below, no. 90), but the Shāhs were in turn forced to acknowledge the suzerainty of these new invaders from the Far East. In effect, the Qara Khitay left the Shāhs largely to themselves, and the last decades of the twelfth century were taken up with a prolonged struggle for hegemony in Khurasan and the whole of the Iranian East between the Shāhs and the Chūrīds of Afghanistan (see below, no. 159). By the opening years of the thirteenth century, the Shāhs were triumphant, and were able to expand right across Persia, clearing away from there the last remnants of Great Seljuq rule and even daring to confront the 'Abbāsīd caliphs in Baghdad. They thus became masters of an empire stretching from the borders of India to those of Anatolia. Yet this impressive achievement proved transitory. In 617/1220, Chingiz Khān's Mongols conquered Transoxania, and the reign of the last Khwārazm Shāh, Jalāl al-Dīn, was spent in heroic but futile attempts to stem the Mongol influx into the Middle East.

In subsequent centuries, Khwārazm came under the rule of various Turco-Mongol and Turkish Central Asian steppe peoples, and its original Iranian character was completely overlaid, although the prestigious title of Khwārazm Shāh seems to have been borne by the governors there for the Tīmūrīds as late as the fifteenth century.

Justi, 428; Lane-Poole, 176–8 (the Anūshtiginids only); Sachau, 12 no. 17 (the Ma'mūnids); Zambaur, 208–9; Album, 38–9.

E. Sachau, 'Zur Geschichte und Chronologie von Khwārazm', *SBWAW*, 73 (1873), 471–506; 74 (1873), 285–330 (includes a list of the Afrīghīds as given by al-Bīrūnī).

W. Barthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol Invasion*, 3rd edn, 144–55, 185, 275–9, 323ff. İbrahim Kafesoğlu, *Harezmşahlar devleti tarihi* (485–617/1092–1229), Ankara 1956 (on the Anūshtiginids).

C. E. Bosworth, in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, V, 140ff., 181ff., 185–95 (on the Anūshtiginids).

L. Richter-Bernburg, 'Zur Titulatur der Hwārezm-Šāhe aus der Dynastie Anūstegins', *AMI*, N.F., 9 (1976), 179–205.

‘Alī b. Mūsā b. Satuq Bughra Khān (d. 388/998) and
 Hārūn or Ḥasan b. Sulaymān b. Satuq Bughra Khān,
 Ilig, Bughra Khān, Shihāb al-Dawla (d. 382/992), joint
 founders of the Qarakhānid confederation in
 Transoxania

1. The Great Qaghans of the united kingdom

- o ? ‘Alī b. Mūsā, Abu ‘l-Ḥasan Arslan Khān Qara Khān
- o 388/998 Aḥmad b. ‘Alī, Arslan Qara Khān, Toghan Khān, Nāṣir
 al-Ḥaqq Qutb al-Dawla
- o 408/1017 Maṣṣūr b. ‘Alī, Arslan Khān, Nūr al-Dawla
- o 415/1024 Muḥammad or Aḥmad b. Hārūn or Ḥasan Bughra Khān,
 Toghan Khān
- o 417–24/1026–32 Yūsuf b. Hārūn or Ḥasan Bughra Khān, Qadīr Khān,
 Nāṣir al-Dawla Malik al-Mashriq wa ‘l-Šīn

2. The Great Qaghans of the western kingdom (Transoxania, including Bukhara and Samarkand, and Farghāna at times), with its centre at Samarkand

- o after c. 411/c. 1020,
 in control of Soghdia ‘Alī Tigin b. Hārūn or Ḥasan Bughra Khān, d. 425/1034
- 425/1034 o Yūsuf and Arslan Tigin b. ‘Alī Tigin, their father’s
 successors in Soghdia)
- o c. 433/c. 1042 Muḥammad b. Naṣr b. ‘Alī, Arslan Qara Khān Mu’ayyid
 al-‘Adl ‘Ayn al-Dawla
- o c. 444/c. 1052 Ibrāhīm b. Naṣr b. ‘Alī, Abu Ishāq Bōri Tigin,
 Tamghach or Tabghach Bughra Khān, victor over the
 sons of ‘Alī Tigin
- 460/1068 Naṣr b. Ibrāhīm, Abu ‘l-Ḥasan Shams al-Mulk Malik al-
 Mashriq wa ‘l-Šīn
- 472/1080 Khidr b. Ibrāhīm, Abū Shujā’
- ?473/1081 Aḥmad b. Khidr
- 482/1089 Ya’qūb b. Sulaymān b. Yūsuf Qadīr Khān
- 488/1095 Mas’ūd b. Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm
- o 490/1097 Sulaymān b. Dāwūd b. Ibrāhīm, Qadīr Tamghach or
 Tabghach Khān
- o 490/1097 Maḥmūd b. ... Maṣṣūr b. ‘Alī Abu ‘l-Qāsim Arslan
 Khān
- o 492/1099 Jibrā’il b. ‘Umar, Qadīr Khān
- o 495/1102 Muḥammad b. Sulaymān, Arslan Khān
- ?523/1129 Naṣr b. Muḥammad

- o 523/1129 Aḥmad b. Muḥammad, Qadīr Khān
- 524/1130 Ḥasan b. 'Alī, Jalāl al-Dunyā wa 'l-Dīn
- 526/1132 Ibrāhīm b. Sulaymān, Abu 'l-Muẓaffar Rukn al-Dunyā wa 'l-Dīn
- 526/1132 Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad (later, ruler of Khurasan after the Seljuq Sanjar: see below, no. 91, 1)
- 536/1141 *Occupation of Transoxania by the Qara Khitay*
- 536/1141 Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad, Tamghach or Tabghach Khān
- 551/1156 'Alī b. Ḥasan, Chaghri Khān
- o 556/1161 Mas'ūd b. Ḥasan, Abu 'l-Muẓaffar Tamghach or Tabghach Khān, Rukn al-Dunyā wa 'l-Dīn
- 566/1171 Muḥammad b Mas'ūd, Tamghach or Tabghach Khān, Ghiyāth al-Dunyā wa 'l-Dīn, d. 569/1174
- 574/1178 Ibrāhīm b. Ḥusayn, Arslan Khān Ulugh Sulṭān al-Salāṭīn Nuṣrat al-Dunyā wa 'l-Dīn (before 574/1178 in Farghāna, thereafter in Samarkand also)
- 600-9/1204-12 'Uthmān b. Ibrāhīm, Ulugh Sulṭān al-Salāṭīn, vassal on various occasions of the Qara Khitay and the Khwārazm Shāhs
- 609/1212 *Occupation of Transoxania by the Khwārazm Shāh*

3. The Great Qaghans of the eastern kingdom (Ilāq, Talas, Shāsh, at times Farghāna, Semirechye, Kāshghar and Khotan), with its centre at Balāsāghūn, later Kāshghar

- 423/1032 Sulaymān b. Yūsuf, Abū Shujā' Qadīr Khān, Arslan Khān, Sharaf al-Dawla
- 448/1056 Muḥammad b. Yūsuf Qadīr Khān, Bughra Khān, Qawām al-Dawla
- 449/1057 Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad
- 451/1059 Maḥmūd b. Yūsuf Qadīr Khān, Toghri'l Qara Khān, Nizām al-Dawla
- 467/1074 'Umar b. Maḥmūd, Toghri'l Tigin
- 467/1075 Hārūn or Ḥasan b. Sulaymān, Abū 'Alī Tamghach or Tabghach Bughra Qara Khān, Nāṣir al-Haqq
- 496/1103 Aḥmad or Hārūn b. Hārūn or Ḥasan, Nūr al-Dawla
- 522/1128 Ibrāhīm b. Aḥmad or Hārūn
- 553/1158 Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm, Arslan Khān
- ? Yūsuf b. Muḥammad, Abu 'l-Muẓaffar Arslan Khān, d. 601/1205
- 607/1211 Muḥammad b. Yūsuf, Abu 'l-Faṭḥ, d. 607/1211
- 607/1211 *Occupation of Semirechye and Farghāna by the Nayman Mongol Küchlüg*

4. The Qaghans in Farghāna, with their centre in Uzgend

- o 386-403/996-1013 Naṣr b. 'Alī b. Mūsā, Tigin, Ilig Khān
- o 403-15/1013-24 Maṇṣūr b. 'Alī b. Mūsā, Abu 'l-Muẓaffar Arslan Khān, Sharaf al-Dawla

- o c. 432/c. 1041 Muḥammad b. Naṣr b. 'Alī, 'Ayn al-Dawla, under the suzerainty of the eastern kingdom, d. c. 444/c. 1052
- o by 451/1059 Ibrāhīm b. Naṣr, Abū Ishāq Tamghach or Tabghach Khān
 - ? 'Abd al-Mu'min
 - ? 'Alī b. 'Abd al-Mu'min
 - ? Ḥasan (Tigin) b. 'Alī
- 526/1132 Ḥusayn b. Ḥasan (Tigin), Jalāl al-Dunyā wa 'l-Dīn
- o 551/1156 Maḥmūd b. Ḥusayn, Toghan Khān
- o 559/1164 Ibrāhīm b. Ḥusayn, Arslan Khān, after 574/1178 in Samarkand also
- o 574/1178 Naṣr b. Ḥusayn
 - o ? Muḥammad b. Naṣr, d. c. 578/1182
- o by 606/1209 Qadīr Khān b. Ḥusayn or Naṣr, Jalāl al-Dunyā wa 'l-Dīn, vassal of the Khwārazm Shāh
- o ? -610/? -1213 Maḥmūd b. Aḥmad, vassal of the Khwārazm Shāh and then of Küchlüg

The Turkish dynasty of the Qarakhānids acquired this name from European orientalists because of the frequency of the word *qara* 'black' > 'northern' (the basic orientation of the early Turks) > 'powerful' in their Turkish titulature; they have also been called the Ilek (properly Ilig) Khāns, again from one of the terms in the hierarchy of this titulature, and Āl-i Afrāsiyāb 'House of Afrāsiyāb' because of a fancied connection with the ruler of Tūrān in Firdawsī's *Shāh-nāma*. It has been suggested by a leading authority on the dynasty, Omeljan Pritsak, that the Qarakhānids sprang from the Qarluq, a tribal group which had been formerly connected with the Uyghur confederation and as such had played an important role in earlier steppe history; another scholar, Elena Davidovich, has suggested a connection with the Yaghma or Chigil tribes, which were in any case components of the Qarluq.

The Qarakhānids became Muslim in the middle years of the tenth century, and their then head Satuq Bughra Khān assumed the Islamic name of 'Abd al-Karīm. His grandson Hārūn or Ḥasan Bughra Khān was attracted southwards by the unsettled condition of Transoxania caused by the decline there of the Sāmānids, and in 392/992 temporarily occupied Bukhara. A few years later, the Ilig Khān Naṣr and Maḥmūd of Ghazna finally extinguished the authority of the Sāmānids and divided their lands. The Oxus became the boundary between the two empires, and for the next two centuries the territories of the Qarakhānids stretched from Bukhara and the lower Syr Darya in the west to Semirechye and Kashgharia in the east. The Qarakhānids formed a loose confederation rather than a monolithic, unitary state, with various members of the family holding appanages which, if they held more than one, were not necessarily contiguous. Internal quarrels soon appeared, and after c. 432/c. 1041 there were two main parts of the Qarakhānid dominions, a western Khanate centred on Samarkand in Transoxania and at times including Farghāna, while an eastern one included the lands of the middle Syr Darya valley, at times Farghāna, Semirechye, and Kashgharia in eastern Turkestan, with a military capital, the Khāns' *ordu* or encampment, near Balāsāghūn, but with Kāshghar as its religious and cultural

centre. Farghāna was a substantial appanage which often had its own hereditary branch of subordinate Khāns. In general, the descendants of the Great Qaghan 'Alī b. Mūsā (the 'Alid branch, in Pritsak's convenient terminology) ruled in the west, while those of his cousin Hārūn or Ḥasan Bughra Khān b. Sulaymān (the Ḥasanid branch) ruled in the east. The boundary between these was not hard and fast, and members of each might rule in the other parts of the Qarakhānid lands; in the later twelfth century, the Hasanids were ruling in Samarkand. The western Khanate flourished under such rulers as Ibrāhīm Tamghach or Tabghach Khān, but in the later eleventh century fell under the suzerainty of the Seljuqs. However, after Sanjar's disastrous defeat in the Qatwān Steppe in 536/1141, control over the whole of Turkestan west of the T'ien Shan mountains passed to the Buddhist Qara Khitay or Western Liao from northern China. The last western Qarakhānids continued as vassals of the Qara Khitay but failed to maintain their position against the Khwārazm Shāh 'Alā' al-Dīn Muḥammad (see above, no. 89, 4), who in 609/1212 killed the last ruler there, 'Uthmān, while the eastern Khanate fell to the Mongol Küchlüg just before Chingiz Khān's hordes arrived in Central Asia.

Whereas the originally Turkish Ghaznawid sultans built up a strongly centralised state on the familiar Perso-Islamic pattern, the Qarakhānids remained closer to their tribal and steppe past and had a more diffused system of authority, with members of the ruling family allocated their own appanages and the greater part of their tribesmen remaining probably nomadic. Within the ruling family there prevailed the system, common among other Altaic peoples, of Great Qaghans and co-Qaghans, with lesser Khāns beneath them, each with his own suitable Turkish title, often combined with a totemistic title taken from the names of animals, birds, etc., for example *arslan* 'lion', *bughra* 'camel', *toghril* and *chaghri* 'falcon, hawk', etc. Since members of the family were continually moving up in the hierarchy of power and acquiring new names and titles, the task of elucidating the genealogy and chronology of the Qarakhānids is exceedingly difficult; the historical sources are not numerous, and, while large numbers of Qarakhānid coins are extant, these last also present a bewildering array of names and titles. As remarked in the Introduction, Zambaur noted over seventy years ago that this was the only major Islamic dynasty whose genealogy remained obscure, and confessed that his own attempts at constructing a genealogy were necessarily sketchy; many obscurities still remain despite much recent research and many coin finds within Central Asia, the contents of which are increasingly ending up in the West. The tables given above follow the researches of Pritsak supplemented by those more recent ones of Elena Davidovich.

Zambaur, 206–7; Album, 34.

EP² 'Tlek Khāns' (C. E. Bosworth).

O. Pritsak, 'Karachanidische Streitfragen 1–4', *Oriens*, 3 (1950), 209–28.

O. Pritsak, 'Die Karachaniden', *Der Islam*, 31 (1954), 17–68.

Reşat Genç, *Karahanlı devlet teşkilatı (XI. yüzyıl) (Türk hâkimiyet anlayışı ve Karahanlılar)*, İstanbul 1981.

Elena A. Davidovich, 'The Qarakhānids', in *History of the Civilisations of Central Asia*, IV/1, *The Age of Achievement*, UNESCO, Paris 1997, ch. 6.

THIRTEEN

The Mongols and their Central Asia and Eastern European Successors

THE MONGOLS OR CHINGIZIDS

The recorded history of the Mongols begins only at the end of the twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth centuries, for it is only with the thirteenth-century *Secret History of the Mongols* and some Persian and Chinese sources of that time that any historical records become available. It seems, however, that the Mongols were originally a forest people, inhabiting the Siberian and Outer Mongolian forest fringes around Lake Baikal and the river basins to the south-east of it, rather than steppe nomads, even though it is as steppe conquerors, moving swiftly on horseback across vast distances, that they first appear in history. It also seems that the Mongols were, from the outset, intermingled and intermarried with the Turkish tribes of what is now Mongolia, so that the whole of the movements and conquests of the Mongols ought more properly to be described as those of the Turco-Mongols.

The father of Chingiz (in Mongolian, Chinggis), Yesügey, was the minor chieftain of a Mongol clan. Chingiz was perhaps born around 1167, and originally had the name Temüjin (= 'blacksmith'). He rose to prominence in Mongolia through the patronage of a chief of the Turkish Kereyt tribe, Toghrıl, Wang or Ong Khān (Qa'an) (the Prester John of Marco Polo). Later, Temüjin quarrelled with Toghrıl, and defeated in battle first Toghrıl and then a Mongol rival Jamuqa. He had already acquired the title of Chinggis (? < Turkish *tengiz* 'sea' = 'Oceanic, Universal [Qa'an or Khān]'), and at a *Quriltay* or assembly of Turco-Mongol chiefs in 1206 was acclaimed as Supreme Chief of all the Turco-Mongol peoples. He now expanded beyond the confines of Mongolia, and undertook campaigns against the Tibetan Tanguts of the Kansu and Ordos regions of north-western China, and in 1213 invaded China proper, sacking the northern capital of the Chin Emperors in 1215 and undermining their position. Turning westwards now, an invasion of Semirechye in 1218 gave Chingiz a common frontier with the territories of the Islamic Khwārazm Shāhs (see above, no. 89, 4). There had already been peaceful diplomatic contacts, but the incident at Utrār on the Syr Darya in 615/1218, when the Khwārazmian governor there massacred Chingiz's envoys and a whole caravan of Muslim merchants accompanying them, precipitated the Mongol invasion of the Islamic lands. In 616–17/1219–20, Transoxania was conquered; Chingiz's son Toluy was sent into Khurasan, and, after a momentary reverse at Parwān in Afghanistan, the last Khwārazm Shāh, Jalāl al-Dīn, was pursued into India (618/1221). Meanwhile, two other sons, Jochi and Chaghatay, were operating in the region of the lower Syr Darya and Khwārazm,

destroying the homeland of the Shāhs; for the last years of his life, Jalāl al-Dīn was a fugitive, fleeing ever westwards before the Mongols.

It was the custom of Mongol chiefs to distribute sections of their territories to other members of their families, and this Chingiz had done before his death in 624/1227, allotting each of them a stretch of pasture ground (a *yurt* or *nuntuq*) for their followers and herds. The territories which the Mongols had already overrun were too vast to be ruled as a centralised state, and the Mongols themselves were politically and administratively quite unsophisticated; the Mongol language was not yet at this time a written one. Hence a bureaucracy had to be hastily improvised for the conquered lands, if only to divide up booty and to collect taxation for the khāns. The official classes of these lands, Khitan, Uyghur, Chinese and Persian, were drawn upon, and the Buddhist Uyghur Turkish secretaries, the *bitikchis*, were especially noteworthy. It is from two Persian Muslims in the Mongol service, 'Aṭā' Malik Juwaynī and Rashīd al-Dīn Faḍl Allāh, that much of our knowledge of the early Mongols and their history comes.

Chingiz's lands were accordingly divided among his four sons or their heirs in the following way.

(1) The eldest, Jochi, in fact died just before his father; it was the traditional steppe nomad practice to grant the pasture grounds farthest away from the home camp to the eldest son. Jochi's inheritance now passed to his own son Batu. Jochi's allocation had been of western Siberia and the Qipchaq steppe, extending into southern Russia and including also Khwārazm, which had always been linked culturally and commercially with the lower Volga lands. His son Batu founded the Blue Horde in South Russia, nucleus of the later Golden Horde, while Jochi's eldest son, Orda, founded the White Horde in western Siberia, these two groups being united in the fourteenth century. At a later date, various khanates in Russia and Siberia evolved from the Hordes (see below, nos 136–8), while in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the descendants of another of Jochi's sons, Shīban, namely the Shībānids or Özbegs, made themselves masters of Khwārazm and Transoxania (see below, no. 153).

(2) The second son, Chaghatay, was given the Central Asian lands to the north of Transoxania, roughly those which had been held by the Qara Khitay and which came to be known now as Mogholistan, and extending into Eastern or the later Chinese Turkestan; to these were added Transoxania itself during Ögedey's reign. The western branch of Chaghatay's descendants in Transoxania soon came within the Islamic religious and cultural sphere of influence, but was brought under the control of Timūr Lang; the eastern branch in Semirechye, the Ili basin and across the T'ien Shan mountains in the Tarim basin, was more resistant to Islam. However, the eastern descendants of Chaghatay eventually helped to spread Islam in Eastern Turkestan, and they ruled there until the later seventeenth century (see below, no. 132).

(3) The third son Ögedey had been favoured by Chingiz during his lifetime as his future successor as Great Khān, and this was confirmed in 627/1229 by a *Quriltay* of Mongol chiefs. But within a generation the Supreme Khanate fell into the hands of the descendants of Toluy, although Ögedey's grandson Qaydu retained his territories in the Pamirs and T'ien Shan, was recognised by the Chaghatayids and remained hostile to the Tolu'id Great Khān Qubilai until Qaydu's death in 703/1304.

(4) The youngest son Toluy had received, following traditional steppe practice as *otchigin* 'guardian of the hearth', the heartland of the empire, Mongolia itself. His sons Möngke and Qubilay followed Ögedey's line as Great Khāns, but only Möngke retained the newly-built centre of Qaraqorum in Mongolia as his capital. The Great Khāns' possessions included the Chinese conquests, where the Mongols became known as the Yüan dynasty and reigned until the second half of the fourteenth century. The cultural and religious attractions of Chinese civilisation proved strong for the Great Khāns in their northern Chinese capital of Peking; they became Buddhists, and their adherence to this faith, which was to become the dominant one in Mongolia itself, gradually opened up a breach with the subordinate Mongol khāns in western Asia and Russia, who adopted Islam in varying stages. It was one of Qubilay's brothers, Hülegü, who launched a fresh wave of conquest upon the Islamic world and who founded the Il Khānid line in Persia; thus the khanates of western Asia ceased, for all practical purposes, to acknowledge the authority of the Great Khāns back in Mongolia and in Peking.

EF² 'Mongols' (D. O. Morgan).

R. Grousset, *L'empire des steppes*, Paris 1939, Eng. tr. *The Empire of the Steppes. A History of Central Asia*, New Brunswick NJ 1970.

J. J. Saunders, *The History of the Mongol Conquests*, London 1971.

B. Spuler, *The Mongols in History*, London 1971.

D. O. Morgan, *The Mongols*, Oxford 1986.

131

THE MONGOL GREAT KHĀNS, DESCENDANTS OF ÖGEDEY AND TOLUY,

LATER THE YÜAN DYNASTY OF CHINA

602–1043/1206–1634

*Mongolia and the conquests made from there, then in Mongolia and China,
then in Mongolia alone*

- o 602/1206 Chinggis (Chingiz), son of Yesügey, d. 624/1227
 - o 626/1229 Ögedey Khān, son of Chingiz
 - o 639/1241 Töregene Khātūn, widow of Ögedey, as regent
 - 644/1246 Güyük, son of Ögedey
 - 646/1248 Oghul Ghaymish, widow of Güyük, as regent
 - o 649/1251 Möngke (Mengü), son of Toluy, d. 657/1259
 - o 658/1260 Qubilay, son of Toluy
 - o (658–62/1260–4 Ariq Böke, son of Toluy, rival Khān in Mongolia)
 - 693/1294 Temür Öljeitü, son of Chen-chin (Jim Gim) and grandson of Qubilay
 - 706/1307 Qayshan Gülük (Hai-shan), son of Darmabala, son of Chen-chin, and great-grandson of Qubilay
 - 711/1311 Ayurparibhadra (Ayurbarwada) or Buyantu, son of Darmabala
 - 720/1320 Suddhipala Gege'en or Gegen (Shidebala), son of Buyantu
 - 723/1323 Yesün Temür, son of Kammala, son of Chen-chin
 - 728/1328 Arigaba (Aragibag), son of Yesün Temür
 - 728/1328 Jijaghatu Toq Temür, son of Qayshan Gülük, first reign
 - 729/1329 Qoshila Qutuqtu, son of Qayshan Gülük
 - 729/1329 Jijaghatu Toq Temür, second reign
 - 733/1332 Rinchenpal (Irinchinbal), son of Qoshila
 - 733–71/1333–70 Toghan Temür, son of Qoshila
- The Great Khāns in China replaced by the Ming dynasty in
770/1368, but the line of Toluy's descendants continuing
in Mongolia until the seventeenth century*

Ögedey's reign was one of resumed, triumphal conquest. That of northern China and what is now Manchuria, with the overthrow of the Chin dynasty and the annexation of Korea, was achieved, though it was not until 1279 that the Sung rulers of southern China were finally extinguished. At the other end of the Old World, Batu was raiding the South Russian steppes and central Europe, terrorising mediaeval Christendom (see below, no. 134, 1). Although Ögedey's son Güyük had numerous offspring, the supreme khanate passed on Güyük's death in April 1248 eventually to another line, that of Möngke and the descendants of Toluy. When Möngke's brother Qubilay was hailed as Great Khān by a *Quriltay* in Mongolia which rival branches of the family did not attend, the descendants of Ögedey broke out in revolt, and under Qaydu and his son Chapar were for long an embarrassment to the Great Khāns. They submitted in the end to the family of Toluy, but in later times various members of the house of Ögedey were raised to power in periods of revolution and unrest, and the great Tīmūr (see below, no.

144) set up two of these in Transoxania, Soyurghatmish and his son Maḥmūd, to replace the Chaghatayids there.

The Great Khāns in Qaraqorum and, after Möngke's time, in Peking or Khān baliq (= 'City of the Khāns') led a life of a certain barbarian splendour, as the accounts of travellers and visitors from Western Europe like Marco Polo and from the Near East like the Armenian king Hayton show. Material wealth and plunder gained from the Mongol conquests flowed into the capital; artisans and craftsmen were gathered there; scholars, writers and religious leaders made their way to the khāns' encampment. The Mongols displayed the traditional steppe tolerance of religions, or indifference to them, and were willing to give a hearing to the arguments of Latin and Nestorian Christians, Muslims, Buddhists and Confucianists. Inevitably, in Mongolia and northern China, the original animistic shamanism of the Mongols gave way to one of the higher religions, in fact to Buddhism in the Tibetan Lamaist form. This became and has remained the dominant religion of the Mongols of Eastern Asia, and was even carried westwards to the Volga and Kuban river regions by the Oyrot Mongols or Kalmucks in their great migration of the early seventeenth century.

The Mongol Great Khāns gradually settled down to being yet another Chinese dynasty of barbarian origin, the Yüan, considered in traditional Chinese historiography as the Twentieth Official Dynasty and as ruling from 1280 onwards. They ruled in China until in 1368 they were replaced by the native Ming, but well before that they had ceased to have much influence over the Mongol khanates of central and western Asia. Only in Mongolia did the descendants of the Great Khāns survive with some independence, though under the general suzerainty of the Ming emperors.

Lane-Poole, 201-16; Zambaur, 241-3; Album, 43.

EP² 'Čingiz-Khān' (J. A. Boyle), 'Kubilay' (W. Barthold and J. A. Boyle), 'Öldjejtü' (D. O. Morgan); EIR 'Čengiz' (D. O. Morgan).

L. Hambis, *Le chapitre CVII du Yuan Che, les généalogies impériales mongoles dans l'histoire chinoise officielle de la dynastie mongole* (= Supplement to TP, 38, Leiden 1945), 51-2, 71-3, 85-9, 106-9, 114-17, 128-32, 136-44. 153-5, 157-8 (tables based on both Chinese and Persian sources).

F. W. Cleaves, 'The Mongol names and terms in the *History of the Nation of Archers* by Grigor of Akanc', *HJAS*, 12 (1949), 400-43.

J. A. Boyle, 'On the titles given in Juvainī to certain Mongol princes', *HJAS*, 19 (1956), 146-54.

idem, *The Successors of Genghis Khan, translated from the Persian of Rashīd al-Dīn*, New York and London 1971, with a genealogical table at p. 342.

D. O. Morgan, *The Mongols*, with genealogical tables at pp. 222-3.

132

THE CHAGHATAYIDS, DESCENDANTS OF CHAGHATAY

624–764/1227–1363

Transoxania, Mogholistan including Semirechye, and eastern Turkestan

- o 624/1227 Chaghatay, son of Chingiz
- o 642/1244 Qara Hülegü, son of Mö'etüken, son of Chingiz, first reign
- o 644/1246 Yesü Möngke, son of Chaghatay
- 649/1251 Qara Hülegü, second reign
- o 650/1252 Orqina Khātūn, widow of Qara Hülegü
- o 658/1260 Alughu, son of Baydar, son of Chaghatay
- 664/1266 Mubārak Shāh, son of Qara Hülegü
- o c. 664/c. 1266 Baraq, Ghiyāth al-Dīn, son of Yesün Du'a, son of Mö'etüken
- 670/1271 Negübey (Nīkpāy), son of Sarban, son of Chaghatay
- o 670/1272 Buqa or Toqa Temür, son of Qadaqchi Sechen and great-grandson of Mö'etüken
- o c. 681/c. 1282 Du'a (Duwa), son of Baraq
- 706/1306 Könchek, son of Du'a
- 708/1308 Taliqu, son of Qadaqchi Sechem and great-grandson of Mö'etüken
- 709/1309 Kebek (Köpek), son of Du'a, first reign
- o 709/1309 Esen Buqa, son of Du'a
- o c. 720/c. 1320 Kebek, second reign
- o 726/1326 Eljigedey, son of Du'a
- 726/1326 Du'a Temür, son of Du'a
- o 726/1326 Tarmashīrīn, 'Alā' al-Dīn, son of Du'a
- 734/1334 Buzan, son of Du'a Temür
- o 734/1334 Changshi, son of Ebügen, son of Du'a
- o c. 739/c. 1338 Yesün Temür, son of Ebügen
- o (742–4/1341–3 'Alī Khalīl (Allāh), descendant of Ögedey)
- o c. 743/c. 1342 Muḥammad, son of Pūlād, son of Könchek
- o 744/1343 Qazan, son of Yasa'ur, son of Du'a, k. 747/1347
- o 747/1346 Dānishmendji, son of 'Alī Sultān, descendant of Ögedey
- o 749/1358 Buyan Quli, son of Surughu Oghul, son of Du'a, k. 759/1358
- 760/1359 Shāh Temür b. 'Abdallāh b. Qazghan
- o 760–4/1359–63 Tughluq Temür, ? son of Esen Buqa
- 764/1363 *Domination of Tīmūr Lang over the Western Chaghatay Khanate, with the Eastern Khanate remaining in power until the later seventeenth century*

After Chingiz's death, Chaghatay had great prestige as the oldest surviving son and as an acknowledged expert on the Mongol tribal law, the *Yasa*; he was, indeed, strongly anti-Muslim and insisted on enforcing those prescriptions of the *Yasa* which ran counter to the Muslim *Sharī'a*, for example over the slaughtering

of animals for meat and over ablutions in running water. Chaghatay's appanage straddled the T'ien Shan mountains from the Uyghur lands in the east to Soghdia in the west, but the Chaghatay khanate was not really founded until after Chaghatay's own death. His sons and grandsons quarrelled among themselves and conspired against the Great Khān Möngke, and according to William of Rubruck, the Flemish friar who travelled to the Mongol court at Qaraqorum, the whole Mongol empire was divided c. 1250 between Möngke and Batu, son of Jochi. The real founder of the Chaghatay khanate was Chaghatay's grandson Alughu, who took advantage of the civil war between Möngke's sons Qubilay and Arīgh Böke to seize Khwārazm, western Turkestan and Afghanistan, nominally for Arīgh Böke but in fact for himself. These territories became the nucleus of the khanate, which continued now in a slightly reduced form, nominally subject to the Great Khāns but in fact until the end of the thirteenth century sharing influence in Central Asia with Qaydu, the grandson of Ögedey, until the latter's death in 702/1303.

From their geographical position, the Chaghatayids were less directly under the influence of Islam than their relatives in Persia, the Il Khānids (see below, no. 133), and preserved their tribal and nomadic ways much longer. These facts may have contributed to the general decline of urban life and agriculture in Central Asia outside the oases of Transoxania and Eastern Turkestan. The short-reigned Mubārak Shāh (664/1266) was the first Chaghatayid definitely to adopt Islam, but from c. 681/c. 1282 Du'a and his descendants were fiercely pagan and resided in the eastern territories of the khanate. Kebek was the first to return to Transoxania, where he built a palace at Nakhshab or Qarshi (< Mongol 'palace'). Tarmashīrīn (whose name in this Persianised form enshrines a Buddhist Sanskrit one like *Dharmasīla* 'Having the habit of the Dharma or Buddhist law') became a Muslim, but the strongly anti-Islamic nomadic Mongols of the eastern part of the khanate rose against him and killed him in 734/1334.

The unity of the Chaghatayids began to disintegrate soon after this, as Tīmūr Lang rose to power in Transoxania. Various Chaghatayids were placed on the throne in Transoxania by the Turkish amīrs, and then after 764/1363 some descendants of Ögedey were set up by Tīmūr. The Chaghatayids nevertheless survived, and after Tīmūr's death their fortunes revived in Mogholistan and endured there until the mid-fifteenth century under Esen Buqa II b. Uways Khān (r. 833–67/1429–62), a dangerous enemy of the later Tīmūrids; but the Chaghatayids' Transoxanian territories fell to the Shībānids (see below, no. 153) by the beginning of the sixteenth century. Only the eastern branch persisted in Semirechye, with its capital at first at Almaligh in the upper Ili region, and in the Tarim basin, where it expanded towards Turfan and shared power in Kāshghar with the Dughlat tribe of Turks until the final extinction of the Chaghatayids in 1089/1678 and their replacement in Eastern Turkestan by a line of local Naqshbandī religious leaders, the Khōjas.

Lane-Poole, 241–2; Sachau, 30 no. 77; Zambaur, 248–50; Album, 43–4.

*Et*² 'Chaghatay Khān', 'Chaghatay Khānate' (W. Barthold and J. A. Boyle); *EIR* 'Chaghatayid dynasty' (P. Jackson).

L. Hambis, *Le chapitre CVII du Yuan Che*, 56–64.

J. A. Boyle, *The Successors of Genghis Khan*, with a genealogical table at p. 345.

133

THE IL KHĀNIDS, DESCENDANTS OF QUBILAY'S BROTHER HÜLEGÜ
654-754/1256-1353

Persia, Iraq, eastern and central Anatolia

- o 654/1256 Hülegü (Hülākū), son of Toluy
- o 663/1265 Abaqa, son of Hülegü, d. 680/1282
- o 681/1282 Aḥmad Tegüder (Takūdār), son of Hülegü
- o 683/1284 Arghun, son of Abaqa
- o 690/1291 Gaykhatu, son of Abaqa
- o 694/1295 Baydu, son of Taraqay, son of Hülegü
- o 694/1295 Maḥmūd Ghazan (Ghāzān) I, son of Arghun
- o 703/1304 Muḥammad Khudābanda Öljeýtü (Üljäytü), Ghiyāth al-Dīn, son of Arghun
- o 716/1316 Abū Sa'id, 'Alā' al-Dunyā wa 'l-Dīn, Bahādur, son of Öljeýtü
- o 736/1335 Arpa Ke'ün (Gawon), descendant of Arīgh Böke, son of Toluy
- o 736/1336 Mūsā, son of 'Alī, son of Baydu
- o 737-8/1337-8 Muḥammad, descendant of Hülegü's son Möngke Temür
- o (739-54/1338-53 Togha(y) Temür, descendant of one of Chingiz Khān's brothers, either Ötken or Jochi, in control of western Khurasan and Gurgān
- 754-90/1353-88 Luqmān b. Togha(y) Temür, sporadic claimant in Khurasan)
- 738-54/1338-53 *Period of several rival khāns in various parts of Persia nominated by the Jalāyirid Amīr Ḥasan Buzurg (o Toghay Temür, see above; o Jahān Temur) and the Chobanid Amīr Ḥasan Küchük (o Sati Beg Khātūn; o Sulaymān; o Anūshirwān; o Ghazan II); thereafter, Persia divided among local dynasties such as the Jalāyirids, the Muzaffarids and the Sarbadārids*

The Great Khān Möngke entrusted his brother Hülegü with the task of recovering and consolidating the Mongol conquests in Western Asia, for in the interval since Ögedey's death direct control of much of the Islamic world south of the Oxus had slipped out of Mongol hands. Hülegü accordingly came westwards. He overcame the resistance of the Ismā'īlis or Assassins of northern Persia (see above, no. 101) (654/1256); routed a caliphal army in Iraq and murdered the last 'Abbāsīd caliph al-Musta'sim (656/1258); and advanced into Syria where, however, the Mongols were defeated and halted at 'Ayn Jalūt in Palestine by the Mamlūks of Egypt and Syria (see above, no. 31) (658/1260). Even so, Hülegü now became ruler on behalf of the Great Khān of all the regions of Persia, Iraq, Transcaucasia and Anatolia, and assumed the title of *Il Khān*, namely territorial khān, implying subordination to the Great Khān.

The Il Khānid kingdom was now definitely constituted, but it had many external enemies, including the Mamlūks, who had destroyed the popular belief

in Mongol invincibility and were now the standard-bearers of Islam against the scourge of the pagans. The other Mongol houses of the Chaghatayids (see above, no. 132) and the Golden Horde (see below, no. 134) were also hostile over disputed territories in the Caucasus region and on the north-eastern Persian fringes respectively. It was common hostility towards the Il Khānids that brought about a political and commercial alliance of the Mamlūks and the Golden Horde, whereas the Il Khānids for their part sought to conclude an anti-Muslim coalition with the European Christian powers, with the surviving Crusaders in the Levant coastal towns and with the Little Armenian kingdom in Cilicia. Hülegü's wife Doqūz Khātūn was a Nestorian Christian, and the first Il Khānids were favourably inclined towards Christianity and Buddhism.

The Il Khānids managed to hold their own against external foes, but, after the Great Khān Qubilai's death in 693/1294, links with the senior members of the Mongol family in Mongolia and China became very loose, especially as the cultural and religious pressures of the Persian environment brought about the conversion to Islam of Ghazan (his short-reigned predecessor Aḥmad Tegüder had also been converted) and his successors. Abū Sa'īd was the last great Il Khānid. He made peace with the Mamlūks in 723/1323 and thus ended the fighting over possession of Syria, but relations with the Golden Horde and disputes over the Caucasus region continued throughout his reign. It was unfortunate that he died without an heir and, indeed, without any close relations to succeed him. The two decades after his death were filled with a succession of ephemeral khans, raised to the throne by the rival Jalāyirid and Chobanid Amirs, until finally the Il Khānid empire fell apart and was replaced by local dynasties across Persia. It was left to Tīmūr Lang a generation later to reunite the Persian lands under one sovereign.

Despite much warfare and internal disturbance, the Il Khānid period was a prosperous one for Persia. After Ghazan became a Muslim, there began tentatively a reconciliatory process between the Mongol-Turkish military and ruling class and their Persian subjects. The Il Khānid capitals of Tabriz and Marāgha in Azerbaijan became centres of learning, with the natural sciences, astronomy and historical writing especially flourishing. After 707/1307, Öljeitü planned a new capital at Sultāniyya near Qazwīn; artists, architects and craftsmen were encouraged, and distinctive styles of, for example, Il Khānid architecture and painting emerged. The internationalist attitudes of the Mongols and their connections with such ancient cultures as the Chinese brought fresh intellectual, commercial and artistic influences into the Persian world. Colonies of Italian traders now appeared in the capital Tabriz, and the Il Khānid empire played a significant connecting rôle in trade with the Far East and India.

Lane-Poole, 217–21; Zambaur, 244–5; Album, 45–8.

EP² 'Ilkhāns' (B. Spuler).

L. Hambis, *Le chapitre CVII du Yuan Che*, 90–4.

J. A. Boyle, *The Successors of Genghis Khan*, with a genealogical table at p. 343.

B. Spuler, *Die Mongolen in Iran. Politik, Verwaltung und Kultur der Ilchanzeit 1220–1350*, 4th edn, Leiden 1985, with a genealogical table at p. 382.

D. O. Morgan, *The Mongols*, with a genealogical table at p. 225.

1. The line of Batu'ids, Khāns of the Blue Horde in South Russia,
Khwārazm and the western part of the Qīpchaq steppe

- 624/1227 Batu, son of Jochi, d. ?653/?1255
 654/1256 Sartaq, son of Batu
 655/1257 Ulaghchi, son or brother of Sartaq
 655/1257 Berke (Baraka), son of Jochi
 ◊ 665/1267 Möngke (Mengü) Temür, son of Toqoqan, son of Batu
 ◊ 679/1280 Töde Möngke (Mengü), son of Toqoqan
 ◊ 687/1287 Töle Buqa, son of Tartu, son of Toqoqan
 ◊ 690/1291 Toqta, son of Möngke Temür, Ghiyāth al-Dīn
 ◊ 713/1313 Muḥammad Özbeg, son of Toghrılcha, son of Möngke
 Temür, Ghiyāth al-Dīn
 742/1341 Tīnī Beg, son of Özbeg
 ◊ 743/1342 Jānī Beg (Jambek), son of Özbeg
 758–82/1357–80 *Period of anarchy, with several rival claimants, including*
 ◊ *Muḥammad Berdi Beg, ◊ Qulpa, ◊ Muḥammad Nawrüz*
 Beg, ◊ Khidr, ◊ Murād, ◊ Muḥammad Bolaq, etc.

2. The line of Orda, Khāns of the White Horde in western Siberia
 and the eastern part of the Qīpchaq steppe, and, after 780/1378,
 of the Blue and White Hordes united into the Golden Horde of South Russia

- 623/1226 Orda, son of Jochi
 679/1280 Köchü
 701/1302 Buyan
 708/1309 Sāsibuqa (? Sarıgh Buqa)
 c. 715/c. 1315 İlbasan
 720/1320 Mubārak Khwāja
 745/1344 Chimtay
 776/1374 Urus, son of Chimtay
 778/1376 Toqtaqiya, son of Urus
 778/1377 Temür Malik, son of Urus
 ◊ 778/1377 Toqtamış, son of Toli Khwāja or descendant of Orda's
 brother Toqa Temür, Ghiyāth al-Dīn
 ◊ 797/1395 Temür Qutlugh, son of Temür Malik
 ◊ 803/1401 Shādī Beg, son of Temür Malik
 ◊ 810/1407 Pülād (Bolod) Khān, son of Temür Malik
 813/1410 Temür, son of Temür Qutlugh
 ◊ 815/1412 Jalāl al-Dīn, son of Toqtamış
 815/1412 Karīm Berdi, son of Toqtamış
 ◊ 817/1414 Kebek, son of Toqtamış

820/1417	Yeremferden (? Jabbār Berdi), son of Toqtamışh	
o 822/1419	Ulugh Muḥammad, first reign	} rival khāns
o 823/1420	Dawlat Berdi	
825/1422	Baraq	
832/1427	Ulugh Muḥammad, second reign (later in Qazan)	
c. 838/c. 1433	Sayyid Aḥmad I	
o c. 840/c. 1435	Küchük Muḥammad, son of Temür	
c. 871/c. 1465	Aḥmad, son of Temür	
886–903/1481–98,		
904–7/1499–1502	Shaykh Aḥmad, d. 911/1505	} sons of Aḥmad, as co-rulers
886– /1481–	Sayyid Aḥmad II	
886–904/1481–99	Murtaḍā	
907/1502	<i>Defeat of Shaykh Aḥmad by the Giray Khāns of the Crimea and absorption of the Golden Horde into the Crimean Tatar Horde</i>	

Chingiz's eldest son Jochi had been allotted as his appanage western Siberia and the Qipchaq Steppe, and on his death in 624/1227 the eastern part of all this, namely western Siberia, fell to his eldest son Orda, who became titular head of the descendants of Jochi and who founded in his territories the White Horde. Little is known about the early White Horde khāns, but the forceful and energetic Toqtamışh (d. 809/1406) is a figure of major importance in steppe and eastern European history. He united the Batu'id Blue Horde (by now known as the Golden Horde) with the White Horde, and once more made the Golden Horde a power of importance in Russia, sacking Nizhniy Novgorod and Moscow in 784/1382. However, he had the misfortune to come up against Timūr Lang, who drove him out of his capital Saray on the Volga, so that Toqtamışh was forced to flee into exile with Vitold (Vitautas), Grand Duke of Lithuania.

The western half of Jochi's appanage, Khwārazm and the Qipchaq Steppe of South Russia, went to his second son Batu. Batu ravaged Russia almost as far as Novgorod, captured Kiev and attacked Poland and Hungary. Christian Europe was only saved from further molestation after Batu's Liegnitz victory of 638/1241 and the pursuit of the Hungarian King Béla IV to the shores of the Adriatic by the news of the Great Khān Ögedey's death. Based on the capital Saray, Batu's Blue Horde became the nucleus of the Golden Horde (a name apparently given to them by the Russians, *Zolotaya Orda*, although Russian and Polish-Lithuanian sources most usually refer to it simply as 'the Great Horde'). From Özbeg onwards (d. 742/1341), the khāns of the Golden Horde were all Muslims, and this meant that there was a religious gulf fixed between the ruling Golden Horde and the mass of their Orthodox Christian Russian subjects, although Latin Christian missionaries continued to work for some time in the Qipchaq Steppe. The Horde had important commercial links with Anatolia and the Mamlūk empire in Syria and Egypt; slave replenishments were sent to the Mamlūks, while the culture of the Horde received a definite Islamic-Mediterranean impress, in contrast to the Persianised Il Khānids. However, the growth of Ottoman Turkish power and the Ottoman control of the Dardanelles after 755/1354 cut the Horde off from the Mediterranean and contact with the Mamlūks and made them purely a power within Russia.

After Toqtamışh's death, real power in the Golden Horde was held by the

capable 'Mayor of the Palace' Edigü, but after the latter's death in 822/1419 a process of disintegration, involving much internal discord, set in. Already in the later fourteenth century, the rise of Poland-Lithuania and the Principdom of Muscovy had seriously checked the authority of the khāns, and the Ottomans and their allies the Crimean Tatars were also hostile. It was, indeed, the Crimean khān, Mengli Giray, who in 907/1502 defeated the leader of the Horde and incorporated the major part of its manpower into his own forces. But before that date, other khanates had split off from the Golden Horde, under various descendants of a third son of Jochi, Toqa Temür; these included the khanates of Astrakhan (until the Russian conquest of 961/1554: see below, no. 136), of Kazan (until the Russian conquest of 959/1552: see below, no. 137); of Qāsimov (around Ryazan, until c. 1092/c. 1681: see below, no. 138); and of the Crimea (see below, no. 135).

Lane-Poole, 222–31 and table at p. 240; Zambaur, 244, 246–7 and Table S; Album, 44.

L. Hambis, *Le chapitre CVII du Yuan Che*, 52–7.

B. Spuler, *Die Goldene Horde. Die Mongolen in Russland 1223–1502*, 2nd edn, Wiesbaden 1965, with genealogical tables and lists at pp. 453–4.

J. A. Boyle, *The Successors of Genghis Khan*, with a genealogical table at p. 344.

D. O. Morgan, *The Mongols*, with a genealogical table at p. 224.

135

THE GIRAY KHĀNS OF THE CRIMEA, DESCENDANTS OF JOCHI

853–1208/1449–1792

The Crimea and the southern Ukraine

1. The Khāns of the Crimea

- early ninth/
fifteenth century Dawlat Birdi Giray (Kerey) b. Tash Temür and, after 830/
1427, Hājji Giray b. Ghiyāth al-Dīn b. Tash Temür,
rulers in the Crimea under the Golden Horde khāns
- 853/1449 Hājji Giray I b. Ghiyāth al-Dīn b. Tash Temür, inde-
pendent ruler, first reign
 - 860/1456 Haydar Giray b. Hājji I
 - 860/1456 Hājji Giray I, second reign
 - 870/1466 Nūr Dawlat Giray b. Hājji I, first reign
 - 871/1467 Mengli Giray b. Hājji I, first reign
 - 879/1474 Nūr Dawlat, second reign
 - 880/1475 Mengli Giray, second reign
 - 881/1476 Nūr Dawlat Giray, third reign
 - 883/1478 Mengli Giray, third reign
 - 920/1514 Muḥammad Giray I b. Mengli
 - 931/1523 Ghāzī Giray I b. Muḥammad I
 - 932/1524 Sa'adat Giray I b. Mengli
 - 939/1532 Islām Giray I b. Muḥammad I
 - 939/1532 Şahib Giray I b. Mengli
 - 958/1551 Dawlat Giray I b. Mubarak b. Mengli
 - 985/1577 Muḥammad Giray II b. Dawlat I
 - 992/1584 Islām Giray II b. Dawlat I
 - 998/1588 Ghāzī Giray II b. Dawlat I, first reign
 - 1005/1596 Fath Giray I b. Dawlat I
 - 1006/1596 Ghāzī Giray II, second reign
 - 1016/1608 Toqtamış Giray b. Ghāzī II
 - 1017/1608 Salāmat Giray I b. Dawlat I
 - 1019/1610 Muḥammad Giray III b. Sa'adat b. Muḥammad II, first
reign
 - 1019/1610 Jānī Beg Giray b. Mubarak b. Dawlat I, first reign
 - 1032/1623 Muḥammad Giray III, second reign
 - 1033/1624 Jānī Beg Giray, second reign
 - 1033/1624 Muḥammad Giray III, third reign
 - 1036/1627 Jānī Beg Giray, third reign
 - 1044/1635 'Ināyat Giray b. Ghāzī II
 - 1046/1637 Bahādur Giray I b. Salāmat I
 - 1051/1641 Muḥammad Giray IV b. Salāmat I, Şofu, first reign
 - 1054/1644 Islām Giray III b. Salāmat I
 - 1064/1654 Muḥammad Giray IV, second reign
 - 1076/1666 'Adil Giray b. Dawlat b. Fath I

- o 1082/1671 Salīm Giray I b. Bahādur, first reign
- o 1089/1678 Murād Giray b. Mubārak b. Salāmat I
- 1094/1683 Hājji Giray II b. Qirīm b. Salāmat I
- o 1095/1684 Salīm Giray I, second reign
- 1103/1691 Sa'adat Giray II b. Qirīm b. Salāmat I
- o 1103/1691 Safa' Giray b. Safa' b. Salāmat I
- o 1104/1692 Salīm Giray I, third reign
- o 1110/1699 Dawlat Giray II b. Salīm I, first reign
- 1114/1702 Salīm Giray I, fourth reign
- o 1116/1704 Ghāzī Giray III b. Salīm I
- o 1119/1707 Qaplan Giray I b. Salīm I, first reign
- o 1120/1708 Dawlat Giray II, second reign
- o 1125/1713 Qaplan Giray I, second reign
- 1128/1716 Dawlat Giray III b. 'Adil b. Salāmat I
- o 1129/1717 Sa'adat Giray III b. Salīm I
- o 1137/1724 Mengli Giray II b. Salīm I, first reign
- o 1143/1730 Qaplan Giray I, third reign
- o 1149/1736 Fath Giray II b. Dawlat II
- 1150/1737 Mengli Giray II, second reign
- o 1152/1740 Salāmat Giray II b. Salīm I
- o 1156/1743 Salīm Giray II b. Qaplan I
- o 1161/1748 Arslan Giray b. Dawlat II, first reign
- o 1169/1756 Halīm Giray b. Sa'adat III
- o 1172/1758 Qirīm Giray b. Dawlat II, first reign
- o 1178/1764 Salīm Giray III b. Fath II, first reign
- 1180/1767 Arslan Giray, second reign
- o 1181/1767 Maqṣūd Giray b. Salāmat II, first reign
- o 1182/1768 Qirīm Giray, second reign
- o 1182/1769 Dawlat Giray IV b. Arslan, first reign
- o 1183/1769 Qaplan Giray II b. Salīm II
- 1184/1770 Salīm Giray III, second reign
- 1185/1771 Maqṣūd Giray, second reign
- o 1186/1772 Shāhib Giray II b. Salīm III
- o 1189/1775 Dawlat Giray IV, second reign
- o 1191/1777 Shāhīn Giray b. Aḥmad b. Dawlat II, first reign
- 1196–7/1782–3 Bahādur II Giray b. Aḥmad b. Dawlat II
- 1197/1783 *Russian annexation of the Crimea*
- 1197–1201/1783–7 Shāhīn Giray, second reign, as a Russian vassal

2. The Khāns of the Tatars of Bujaq or Bessarabia, as Ottoman nominees

- 1201/1787 Shāhbāz Giray b. Arslan
- 1203–6/1789–92 Bakht Giray

Among the descendants of Jochi's son Toqa Temūr, one branch established itself in the Crimea during the course of the internecine strife which convulsed the Golden Horde after 760/1359. At first they were vassals of Toqtamīsh, but then in the early fifteenth century they gradually became independent under the progeny of Tash Temūr, with Hājji Giray formally declaring himself ruler of

Qırım in 853/1449. The family name Giray derives possibly from that of the Kerey, a component clan of the Golden Horde which had supported Hājji Giray. The Crimean khanate now became one of the most enduring states to arise under the descendants of Chingiz Khān, and by the end of the fifteenth century it also controlled the lands of the Noghays on the northern Black Sea coast as far west as Bujaq or Bessarabia.

The Ottomans were the natural allies of the Girays, at first against the Golden Horde, whose khans continued to regard the Crimea as one of their own dependencies, and then, from the sixteenth century onwards, against the Russians. The Girays claimed to be heirs of the Golden Horde after they had defeated its leader and incorporated the greater part of its fighting manpower into their own forces (see above, no. 134), and did for part of the sixteenth century rule at Kazan (see below, no. 137). Their increased military strength after 907/1502, and the fact that the pasture grounds of the Girays were nearer to Moscow than the Golden Horde's more usual centre on the lower Volga, now meant increased military pressure on Muscovy, with attacks and raids continuing until the eighteenth century. From the later sixteenth century, the khans ruled from their capital at Baghche Saray (Simferopol) over much of the southern part of the Ukraine and the lower Don-Kuban region, acting as a buffer-state between the Ottomans and the Christian powers of Eastern Europe; in fact, during the early seventeenth century they were at times allied with Poland-Lithuania against the Russian Tsars. The Ottomans regarded the Crimean Tatars as their dependents, requiring the presence of a hostage Giray prince at their court, although rarely intermarrying with the Girays; there was a vague feeling that, should the Ottoman dynasty die out (as seemed not impossible at one point in the seventeenth century), the Girays would have a claim on the succession in Turkey.

Russian expansionism southwards brought about Peter the Great's capture of Azov in 1699, which cut the lands of the Crimean Tatars in two. In the eighteenth century, Russian pressure increased, with the enfeebled Ottoman empire unable to help, and by 1197/1783 Catherine the Great's troops had occupied and annexed the Crimea. Two of the Girays were, however, appointed by the Porte to head the Tatars in Bessarabia for a few years.

Lane-Poole, 235–7 and table at p. 240; Zambaur, 247–8 and Table S; Album, 44–5.

IA 'Giray' (Halil İnalçık), with a genealogical table; EI² 'Girāy' (idem), 'Kırım' (B. Spuler), with a list of rulers.

Alan W. Fisher, *The Crimean Tatars*, Stanford CA 1978, 1–69.

136

THE KHĀNS OF ASTRAKHAN (ASTRAKHĀN, ASHTARKHĀN)

871–964/1466–1557

The lower Volga and the adjacent steppelands

- 871/1466 Qāsim b. Maḥmūd b. Kūchūk Muḥammad
- 895/1490 ‘Abd al-Karīm b. Maḥmūd b. Kūchūk Muḥammad
- 909/1504 Qāsim or Qasay b. Sayyid Aḥmad
- 938/1532 Aq Kōbek b. Murtaḍā, first reign
- 941/1534 ‘Abd al-Raḥmān b. ‘Abd al-Karīm
- 945/1538 Shaykh Ḥaydar b. Shaykh Aḥmad
- 948/1541 Aq Kōbek, second reign
- 951/1544 Yaghmurchi b. Birdi Beg
- 961/1554 *Russian conquest*
- 961–4/1554–7 Darwīsh ‘Alī b. Shaykh Ḥaydar, as a Russian nominee
- 964/1557 *Incorporation of the khanate into Russia*

During the decline of the Golden Horde (see above, no. 134), there arose at Astrakhan near the mouth of the Volga (a town long important from its position on the trade route down the Volga to the Caspian Sea and beyond) a line of Noghay Tatar khāns stemming from Orda’s White Horde through Toqtamīsh. The lands of the first khāns extended as far as the Kazan khanate (see below, no. 137) in the north, to Orenburg or Chkalov in the east and the lands of the Crimean Tatar khāns in the west. By the 1530s, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Khān was being pressed by the khāns of Crimea and the Noghays, and appealed for help to the Russian Tsar; but in 961/1554 Ivan IV (‘The Terrible’) conquered Astrakhan, and three years later deposed the puppet Darwīsh ‘Alī Khān when he began seeking support from his Tatar Muslim neighbours, and Astrakhan was incorporated into the Russian empire.

Lane-Poole, 229 and table at p. 240; Zambaur, 247 (fragmentary) and Table S.
IA ‘Astirhan, Astrahan’ (R. Rahmeti Arat); *Et*² ‘Astrakhān’ (B. Spuler).

THE KHĀNS OF KAZAN (QAZĀN)
840–959/1437–1552
The middle Volga region

1. The line of Ulugh Muḥammad

- 840/1437 Ulugh Muḥammad b. Jalāl al-Dīn b. Toqtamīsh
- 849/1445 Maḥmūd (Maḥmūdak) b. Ulugh Muḥammad
- 866/1462 Khalīl b. Maḥmūd
- 871/1467 Ibrāhīm b. Maḥmūd
- 884/1479 ‘Alī b. Ibrāhīm, first reign
- 889/1484 Muḥammad Amīn b. Ibrāhīm, first reign
- 890/1485 ‘Alī b. Ibrāhīm, second reign
- 892/1487 Muḥammad Amīn b. Ibrāhīm, second reign
- (900/1495 Mamūq b. Ibaq, Khān of the Tatars of Siberia)
- 901/1496 ‘Abd al-Latīf b. Ibrāhīm
- 907–24/1502–18 Muḥammad Amīn b. Ibrāhīm, third reign

2. Khāns from various outside lines

- 925/1519 Shāh ‘Alī b. Sayyid Awliyār, from the Khāns of Qāsimov, first reign
- 927/1521 Šāḥib Giray (I) b. Mengli I, from the Khāns of Crimea
- 930/1524 Šafā’ Giray b. Faṭḥ, from the Khāns of Crimea, first reign
- 937/1531 Jān ‘Alī b. Sayyid Awliyār, from the Khāns of Qāsimov
- 939/1533 Šafā’ Giray b. Faṭḥ, second reign
- 953/1546 Shāh ‘Alī b. Sayyid Awliyār, second reign
- 953/1546 Šafā’ Giray b. Faṭḥ, third reign
- 956/1549 Ötemish b. Šafā’ Giray, from the Khāns of Crimea, regent for Süyün Bike
- 958/1551 Shāh ‘Alī b. Sayyid Awliyār, third reign
- 959/1552 Yādīgār Muḥammad b. Qāsim, from the Khāns of Astrakhan
- 959/1552 *Russian conquest*

The Kazan khanate was another of the groupings founded by a Jochid epigone. Toqtamīsh’s grandson Ulugh Muḥammad rose to power in what later became eastern Russia as the Golden Horde decayed, and his son Maḥmūd in 849/1445 seized the actual town of Kazan from a local prince, possibly of Bulghār descent, ‘Alī Beg. It was likewise around this time that the sister khanate of Qāsimov (see below, no. 138) emerged. The khanate spanned the middle Volga basin around the confluence of the Volga and Kama rivers and in the south bordered on the khanate of Astrakhan (see above, no. 136). It thus covered a region which had been exposed to Islamic influences since the constituting of the Bulghār kingdom towards the opening of the tenth century. Kazan’s position gave it a considerable commercial importance, not least as a mart for slaves.

All through the khanate's life, its history was bound up with that of the Princedom of Muscovy, its western neighbour, now reasserting itself after some two centuries of thralldom to the Golden Horde and its successors. From the outset, the Princes interfered in succession disputes within Kazan. This intervention intensified after the end of the family of Ulugh Muḥammad, and the last three decades or so of the khanate saw rulers installed at Kazan from various outside Chingizid lines, with internal tensions between the partisans of an accommodation with Muscovy and those hoping to preserve Kazan's independence through links with the Crimean Tatars and the Noghay Horde. Finally, the army of Tsar Ivan IV captured Kazan in 959/1552, and a systematic Russian occupation and colonisation of the lands of the former khanate began. A considerable proportion of the Muslim Tatar population has nevertheless survived over the centuries, and a reduced part of the khanate formed under the Soviets the Tatar Autonomous SSR.

Lane-Poole, genealogical table at p. 240; Zambaur, 249 and Table S.

1A 'Kazan' (Reşid Rahmati Arat), with a genealogical table; *EP*² 'Kāzān' (W. Barthold and A. Bennigsen).

Azade-Ayşe Rorlich, *The Volga Tatars. A Profile in National Resilience*, Stanford CA 1986, 3–33.

138

THE KHĀNS OF QĀSIMOV

c. 856–1092/c. 1452–1681

The region of Ryazan, to the south-east of Moscow

1. The Khāns from the line of rulers of Kazan

c. 856/c.1452 Qāsim b. Ulugh Muḥammad

873–91/1469–86 Dāniyār b. Qāsim

2. The Khāns from the line of the rulers of the Crimea

891/1486 Nūr Dawlat Giray b. Hājji I

c. 905/c. 1500 Satılghan b. Nūr Dawlat

912/1506 Jānay b. Nūr Dawlat

3. The Khāns from the line of the rulers of Astrakhan

918/1512 Sayyid Awliyār b. Bakhtiyār Sultān b. Kūchūk
Muḥammad

922/1516 Shāh 'Alī b. Sayyid Awliyār, first reign

925–38/1519–32 Jān 'Alī b. Sayyid Awliyār

944–58/1537–51 Shāh 'Alī b. Sayyid Awliyār, second reign

959/1552 Shāh 'Alī, third reign

974/1567 Sayin Bulāt b. Bik Bulāt (Simeon Bekbulatovich), d.

1025/1616

981–1008/1573–1600 Muṣṭafā 'Alī b. Aq Kōbek

4. Kazakh Khān

1008–19/1600–10 Uraz Muḥammad

(1019–23/1610–14 *the throne vacant in Qāsimov*)

5. The Khāns from the line of the rulers of Siberia

1023/1614 Arslan or Alp Arslan b. 'Alī b. Kuchum

1036/1627 Sayyid Burhān b. Arslan (Vassili)

1090–2/1679–81 Fātima Sultān Bike, widow of Arslan

1092/1681 *Annexation to Russia*

The khanate of Qāsimov was another of the distant successors to the *ulus* of Jochi and Batu. It was founded by a member of the ruling family in Kazan, Qāsim, who had fled to Moscow for protection. The Grand Prince Vassili I granted to him the town of Gorodets or Gorodok Meshchevskiy, later named after its ruler Qāsimov, on the Oka river to the south-east of Moscow. This became the centre of a principality which has been described as 'a historical curiosity' but which survived for over two centuries as a petty state, with ill-defined frontiers. The khāns bore in Russian the titles of Tsar and Tsarevitch, and were, in effect, feudal vassals of the Grand Princes and Emperors. Qāsimov was often a refuge for

dissident Chingizids and was ruled at different times by members of the various Jochid lines. Latterly, some of the ruling family in Qāsimov became Christian and entered Russian service, and the khanate was eventually annexed to the Russian crown.

Lane-Poole, 234–5 and genealogical table at p. 240; Zambaur, 249 and Table S.
IA 'Kasım hanlığı' (Reşid Rahmeti Arat); *EI*² 'Kāsimov' (A. Bennigsen).

FOURTEEN

Persia after the Mongols

139

THE KARTS OR KURTS

643–791/1245–1389

Eastern Khurasan and northern Afghanistan

643/1245 Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr Rukn al-Dīn b. ‘Uthmān
Marghānī, Shams al-Dīn I, k. 676/1278

676/1277 Rukn al-Dīn or Shams al-Dīn II b. Muḥammad Shams
al-Dīn I, d. 705/1305

694/1295 Fakhr al-Dīn b. Rukn al-Dīn or Shams al-Dīn II

707/1308 Ghiyāth al-Dīn I b. Rukn al-Dīn or Shams al-Dīn II

729/1329 Shams al-Dīn III b. Ghiyāth al-Dīn I

730/1330 Ḥafīz b. Ghiyāth al-Dīn I

○ 732/1332 Pīr Ḥusayn Muḥammad b. Ghiyāth al-Dīn I, Mu‘izz
al-Dīn

○ 772–91/1370–89 Pīr ‘Alī b. Pīr Ḥusayn Muḥammad Mu‘izz al-Dīn,
Ghiyāth al-Dīn II

791/1389 *Annexation by Tīmūr*

The Karts (a presumably Iranian name of unknown significance) were an indigenous line of Maliks of Afghan stock, from the clan or family of the Shansabānīs of Ghūr (see below, no. 159); the founder, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad I, had married a Ghūrīd princess, so that the Karts could claim to be, in some measure, heirs of the Ghūrīds, ruling also as they did from the former centres of the Ghūrīds, Herat and fortresses within Ghūr.

The incoming Mongols allowed Shams al-Dīn I Muḥammad to retain his lands as a vassal prince, and, ensconced in their nucleus of territories in Herat and the inaccessible mountains of Ghūr, the Karts generally remained loyal allies of the Il Khāns. The decay of Il Khānīd power in Khurasan after Abū Sa‘īd’s death enabled Mu‘izz al-Dīn Pīr Ḥusayn Muḥammad to raise his principality, which now reached to western Khurasan and the Sarbadārīd territories (see below, no. 143), to new heights of power and splendour. But the rise of Tīmūr cut short Kart power, and, on the death of his tributary Ghiyāth al-Dīn II Pīr ‘Alī, Tīmūr annexed the Kart territories to his empire.

Lane-Poole, 252; Zambaur, 256–7; Album, 50.

ET² ‘Kart’ (T. W. Haig and B. Spuler); EIT ‘Āl-e Kart’ (B. Spuler).

B. Spuler, *Die Mongolen in Iran. Politik, Verwaltung und Kultur der Ilchanzeit 1220–1350*, 4th edn, 129–33.

L. G. Potter, *The Kart Dynasty of Herat. Religion and Politics in medieval Iran*, Ph.D diss., Columbia University, New York 1992, unpubl. (UMI Dissertation Services, Ann Arbor).

140

THE MUZAFFARIDS 713–95/1314–93 *Southern and western Persia*

- o 713/1314 Muḥammad b. Muẓaffar Sharaf al-Dīn, Mubārīz al-Dīn, d.
765/1363
- o 759/1358 Shāh-i Shujā' b. Muḥammad Mubārīz al-Dīn, Abu 'l-Fawāris
Jamāl al-Dīn, first reign
- o 765/1364 Shāh Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad Mubārīz al-Dīn, Qutb al-Dīn, d.
776/1375
- 767/1366 Shāh-i Shujā', second reign
- o 786/1384 Zayn al-'Ābidīn 'Alī b. Shāh-i Shujā', Mujāhid al-Dīn
- 789/1387 Shāh Yaḥyā b. Shāh Muẓaffar

b. Muḥammad Mubārīz al-Dīn, in Shīrāz o Sultān Aḥmad b. Muḥammad Mubārīz al-Dīn, 'Imād al-Dīn, in Kirmān Sultān Abū Ishāq b. Sultān Uways b. Shāh-i Shujā', in Sirajān	}	vassals of Timūr
--	---	---------------------
- o 793–5/1391–3 Shāh Maṣṣūr b. Shāh Muẓaffar
- 795/1393 *Timūrid conquest*
- before 810/1407
- or 812/1409 Sultān Mu'taṣīm b. Zayn al-'Ābidīn, attempted to seize Iṣfahān

The Muzaffarids, distantly of Khurasanian Arab origin, rose to power in Kirman, Fars and 'Irāq-i 'Ajam or Jibāl as the Il Khānid empire declined. Sharaf al-Dīn Muẓaffar was in the service of the Mongols, and was appointed by the Il Khān Ghazan to be commander of 1,000, with military and police duties in southern Persia. His son Mubārīz al-Dīn Muḥammad was the second founder of the dynasty. From a base at Yazd, during the chaos attendant on Abū Sa'id's death he expanded his possessions into Fars after protracted struggles with the Inju'id Abū Ishāq (see below, no. 141). A marriage to the daughter of the last Qutlugh Khānid ruler of Kirman (see above, no. 105) brought that province to him. By 758/1356 he was undisputed master of Fars and Iraq, and was tempted into invading Azerbaijan, where he captured Tabriz (Tabrīz) but was unable to hold on to it. Muḥammad was deposed by his own son Shāh-i Shujā', but Shāh Shujā' was involved in disputes with his brother Shāh Maḥmūd, governor in Iṣfahān, until the latter's death. Shāh Maḥmūd had sought the help of the Muzaffarids' old enemies, the Jalāyirids (see below, no. 142), and, when he had at last secured Iṣfahān, Shāh-i Shujā' led an expedition into Azerbaijan against the Jalāyirid Ḥusayn b. Uways. But the shadow of Timūr was now falling across Persia. Shāh-i Shujā' hastened to submit to the great conqueror. His successors, however, were less circumspect. Before his death in 786/1384 Shāh-i Shujā' had divided his Kirman and Fars dominions among his relatives, and dynastic disputes were now fatally to weaken the dynasty. In Fars, Zayn al-'Ābidīn 'Alī submitted at first to Timūr, but Timūr later sacked Iṣfahān after his tax-collectors there had been

killed in a popular uprising. The last Muẓaffarid, Shāh Maṣṣūr, was ruler over all Fars and Iraq when Tīmūr in 795/1393 resolved to extinguish the independent powers of western Persia; Shāh Maṣṣūr was killed in battle and most of the surviving Muẓaffarids massacred.

Although much of the Muẓaffarid period was racked by family strife, they were nevertheless patrons of such great figures as the poet Ḥāfiẓ and the theologian ‘Aḍud al-Dīn Īlī, so that their cultural significance well outweighs their mediocre political aptitudes.

Justi, 460; Lane-Poole, 249–50; Zambaur, 254; Album, 48–9.

*Et*² ‘Muẓaffarids’, ‘*Shāh-i Shudjā*’ (P. Jackson).

H. R. Roemer, ‘The Jalayirids, Muẓaffarids and Sarbadārs’, in *The Cambridge History of Iran*. VI. *The Timurid and Safavid Periods*, Cambridge 1986, 11–16, 59–64.

141

THE INJU'IDS
c. 725–54/c. 1325–53
Fars

- c. 725/c. 1325 Maḥmūd Shāh Inju, Sharaf al-Dīn
- 736/1336 Mas'ūd Shāh b. Maḥmūd Shāh, Jalāl al-Dīn, with his
power contested until 739/1338 by Ghiyāth al-Dīn
Kay Khusraw b. Maḥmūd Shāh
- 739/1339 Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd Shāh, Shams al-Dīn, k. 740/
1340
- ø 743–54/1343–53 Abū Ishāq b. Maḥmūd Shāh, Jamāl al-Dīn, k. 758/1357
- 754/1353 *Occupation of Shiraz (Shīrāz) by the Muẓaffarids*

The Inju'ids derived their name from the fact that the founder of this short line, Sharaf al-Dīn Maḥmūd, was sent to Fars by the Il Khān Öljeytū to administer the royal states there (called in Turkish, and thence in Mongolian, *inju*). During Abū Sa'id's reign, he consolidated his power at Shiraz and made himself virtually the independent ruler of Fars before being executed by the new Il Khān, Arpa Ke'ün (see above, no. 133). His sons squabbled over possession of Fārs, and when the last one, Jamāl al-Dīn Abū Ishāq, tried to extend his power to Yazd and Kirman, he came up against the Muẓaffarids (see above, no. 140), who captured Shiraz in 754/1353, the fugitive Abū Ishāq being killed shortly afterwards.

Sachau, 28 no. 73; Zambaur, 255; Album, 48.

Er² 'Indjū' (J. A. Boyle).

B. Spuler, *Die Mongolen in Iran*, 4th edn, 122.

142

THE JALĀYIRIDS 740–835/1340–1432 *Iraq, Kurdistan and Azerbaijan*

- 740/1340 Shaykh Hasan-i Buzurg b. Ḥusayn, Tāj al-Dīn
- 757/1356 Shaykh Uways I b. Hasan-i Buzurg
- 776/1374 Ḥusayn I b. Shaykh Uways I, Jalāl al-Dīn
- 784/1382 Sulṭān Aḥmad b. Shaykh Uways I, Ghiyāth al-Dīn, k.
813/1410
- (784–5/1382–3 Bāyazīd b. Shaykh Uways I, in Kurdistan)
- 813/1410 Shāh Walad b. ‘Alī b. Shaykh Uways I
- 814/1411 Maḥmūd b. Shāh Walad, first reign, under the tutelage of
Tandu Khātūn
- 814/1411 Uways II b. Shāh Walad
- 824/1421 Muḥammad b. Shāh Walad
- 824/1421 Maḥmūd b. Shāh Walad, second reign
- 828–35/1425–32 Ḥusayn II b. ‘Alā’ al-Dawla b. Sulṭān Aḥmad
- 835/1432 *Qara Qoyunlu conquest of southern Iraq*

The Jalāyirids were one of the successor-states to the Il Khānids, succeeding to their territories in Iraq and Azerbaijan. The Jalāyir were, it seems, originally a Mongol tribe in Hülegü’s following. The founder of the dynasty’s fortunes was Hasan-i Buzurg (called ‘Great’ to distinguish him from his enemy and rival from the Chopanid family of Amīrs, Ḥasan-i Kūchik ‘the Small’), who had been governor of Anatolia under the Il Khān Abū Sa’īd. He eventually prevailed over the Chopanids and made Baghdad the centre of his power; nevertheless, he continued to recognise various Il Khānid *fainéants* up to 747/1346, and it was left to his son Shaykh Uways to assume full personal sovereignty.

Shaykh Uways at first recognised the dominion of the Golden Horde (see above, no. 134) over Azerbaijan, but then in 761/1360 conquered it for himself. He also imposed his overlordship in Fars on the disputing Muzaffarids (see above, no. 140), but his successors had to cope with the rising power of the Qara Qoyunlu Turkmens in Diyār Bakr (see below, no. 145) and an invasion through the Caucasus into Azerbaijan of the Golden Horde Khāns. Shaykh Uways’s son Sulṭān Aḥmad opposed Tīmūr when the latter appeared in northern Persia and Iraq, and had to flee into exile with the Mamlūks in Syria, and he only returned permanently to his capital Baghdad after Tīmūr’s death in 807/1405. However, the shock of the Tīmūrid invasions had much weakened the Jalāyirids’ position. Azerbaijan quickly fell to the Qara Qoyunlu, and Baghdad itself was captured by them in 814/1411. Only in Lower Iraq, at Wāsīt, Baṣra and Shushtar, did minor Jalāyirid princes survive as vassals of the Tīmūrid Shāh Rukh, until Ḥusayn II was killed at Hilla in 835/1432.

The Jalāyirids, on the evidence of their preferences for personal names, may have had some Shī’ī sympathies, although this evidence is not in general strong. Their rule and patronage in Baghdad and Tabriz was of considerable cultural significance, especially in such spheres as architecture and miniature painting,

traditions which were regrettably uprooted by the devastations and deportations of Tīmūr.

Lane-Poole, 246–8; Zambaur, 253; Album, 49.

*EI*² 'Djalāyir, Djalāyirid' (J. M. Smith Jr).

H. R. Roemer, in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, VI, 5–10, 64–7.

143

THE SARBADĀRIDS

737–88/1337–86

Western Khurasan

- 737/1332 ‘Abd al-Razzāq b. Faḍl Allāh
- 738/1338 Mas‘ūd b. Faḍl Allāh, Wajih al-Dīn
- 743/1343 Muḥammad Ay Temūr, k. 747/1346
- o 748/1347 ‘Alī b. Shams al-Dīn Chishumī, Khwāja Tāj al-Dīn
- o 752/1351 Yaḥyā Karāwī, k. 759/1357

Luṭf Allāh b. Mas‘ūd Wajih al-Dīn; Amīr Walī, in Astarābād; Ḥaydar Qaṣṣāb; Ḥasan Dāmghānī, k. 763/1362	}	Confused period, with various rivals for power
---	---	--
- o 763/1362 Khwāja ‘Alī b. Mu‘ayyad, first reign
- 778/1376 Rukn al-Dīn
- 781–8/1379–86 Khwāja ‘Alī, second reign
- 788/1386 *Division of territories among several commanders of the*
Timūrids

The Sarbadārids (roughly interpretable as ‘reckless ones’) ruled in the Bayhaq or Sabzawār district of Khurasan during the period between the death of the Il Khānid Abū Sa‘īd and the steep decline of his dynasty’s power (see above, no. 133) and the rise of Timūr. Rather than being a ‘bandit state’ or a millenarian Shī‘ī movement, the Sarbadārids represented an attempt by the local populations of western Khurasan to preserve some order and security there in the aftermath of Mongol rule over Persia; thus in some ways they form a later, and shorter-lived, counterpart to the earlier constituting of the Kart Maliks’ principality in eastern Khurasan (see above, no. 139).

The Sarbadārid movement began as a rising in 737/1332 against fiscal oppression under the Chingizid Toqay Temūr. The rebels soon afterwards made an uneasy alliance with local Shī‘ī shaykhs. In 754/1353 they succeeded in overthrowing and killing Toqay Temūr, the last of his line. Leadership within the Sarbadār movement was unstable and often contested. Under the last leader, Khwāja ‘Alī, Shī‘ism was explicitly adopted, but Khwāja ‘Alī also submitted to Timūr. When the former died in 788/1386, the Sarbadārid lands were divided among several commanders who also served Timūr.

Lane-Poole, 251; Zambaur, 258; Album, 50.

ET² ‘Sarbadārids’ (C. P. Melville).

J. Masson Smith Jr, *The History of the Sarbadār Dynasty 1336–1381 A.D. and its Sources*, The Hague 1970, with a list and discussion of the confused chronology of the Sarbadārid commanders, and the contradictory information of the sources, at pp. 52–4.

A. H. Morton, ‘The history of the Sarbadārs in the light of new numismatic evidence’, *NC*, 7th series, 16 (1976), 255–8.

H. R. Roemer, in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, VI, 16–39.

144

THE TĪMŪRIDS 771–913/1370–1507 *Transoxania and Persia*

1. The rulers in Samarkand

- 771/1370 Tīmūr-i Lang (Tamerlane) b. Taraghay Barlas, Kūreken
- 807–9/1405–7 Pīr Muḥammad b. Jahāngīr b. Tīmūr, in Kandahar (Qandahār)
- 807–11/1405–9 Khalīl Sultān b. Mīrān Shāh b. Tīmūr, in Samarkand, d. 814/
1411
- 807–11/1405–9 Shāh Rukh b. Tīmūr, in Khurasan only
- 811/1409 Shāh Rukh, in Transoxania, eastern and central Persia
and then western Persia
- 850/1447 Ulugh Beg b. Shāh Rukh, in Transoxania and Khurasan
- 853/1449 ‘Abd al-Laṭīf b. Ulugh Beg, in Transoxania
- 854/1450 ‘Abdallāh b. Ibrāhīm b. Shāh Rukh, in Transoxania
- 855/1451 Abū Sa’īd b. Muḥammad b. Mīrān Shāh, in Transoxania,
eastern, central and western Persia as far as ‘Irāq-i
‘Ajam
- 873/1469 Sultān Aḥmad b. Abī Sa’īd, in Transoxania
- 899/1494 Maḥmūd b. Abī Sa’īd, in Transoxania
- Baysonqur b. Maḥmūd
- 900–6/1495–1500 ◦ Mas’ūd b. Maḥmūd } in Transoxania
- ‘Alī b. Maḥmūd
- 906/1500 *Özbeq conquest of Transoxania and Farghāna*

2. The rulers in Khurasan after Ulugh Beg’s death

- 851/1447 Bābur b. Baysonqur, Abu ‘l-Qāsim
- 861/1457 Shāh Maḥmūd b. Bābur
- 861/1457 Ibrāhīm b. ‘Alā’ al-Dawla b. Baysonqur
- 863/1459 Abū Sa’īd b. Muḥammad b. Mīrān Shāh
- 873/1469 Husayn b. Maṣṣūr b. Bayqara b. ‘Umar Shaykh b. Tīmūr,
first reign
- 875/1470 Yādgar Muḥammad b. Sultān Muḥammad b. Baysonqur,
protégé of the Aq Qoyunlu Uzun Ḥasan in Herat, k.
875/1470
- 875/1470 Husayn b. Maṣṣūr b. Bayqara, second reign
- 911/1506 ◦ Badī’ al-Zamān b. Husayn, d. 923/1517 } co-rulers
- Muẓaffar Husayn b. Husayn
- 913/1507 *Özbeq conquest of Herat*

3. The rulers in western Persia and Iraq after Tīmūr

- 795/1393 Mīrān Shāh b. Tīmūr, Jalāl al-Dīn, governor of ‘Irāq-i
‘Ajam and Azerbaijan, 806/1404 in ‘Irāq-i ‘Arab, k.
810/1408

- 807–12/1404–9 Pīr Muḥammad b. ‘Umar Shaykh b. Tīmūr, in Fars
 807–12/1404–9 Rustam b. ‘Umar Shaykh, in southern ‘Irāq-i ‘Ajam
 812/1409 Khalīl Sulṭān b. Mirān Shāh, in Rayy, d. 814/1411
 812/1409 Bayqara b. ‘Umar Shaykh, in Fars
 815–17/1412–14 Iskandar b. ‘Umar Shaykh, in Fars and then ‘Irāq-i ‘Ajam
 817/1414 Shāh Rukh b. Tīmūr, uniting western and central Persia
 with his Transoxanian and Khurasanian territories

Tīmūr arose from the Barlas clan of Turkicised Mongols which had nomadised within the Chaghatayid *ulus* (see above, no. 132). Although his family may subsequently have claimed Chingizid descent, Tīmūr personally never did, and always contented himself with the Arab-Islamic title of Amīr, and not the Turkish one of Khān. He did, however, acquire the title *güregen/küreken*, in Mongolian ‘royal son-in-law’, by virtue of his marriage to a Chingizid princess. He put together a vast military empire in central, western and southern Asia. But Tīmūr’s interests were in the settled lands of ancient Islamic or Indian culture rather than in the steppes and mountains of Inner Asia, thus marking him off from the earlier Mongol steppe conquerors. He eventually built himself a permanent capital, Samarkand; and though clearly not a religious man, he found the religious ideology of Islam a useful aid in his campaigns into such regions as the Caucasus and India.

Tīmūr’s rise to power took place in a fragmented Transoxania, weakened by the decay of the Chaghatayids of the west, during which various attempts from Moghollistan to re-establish the *ulus* failed. There was still a certain feeling, however, for the legitimacy of Mongol rule, and when Tīmūr first came to power he installed puppet Chingizid khāns in Transoxania, including a descendant of the Great Khan Ögedey, Soyurghatmish, and his son.

His first campaigns were in Khwārazm and Khurasan, after which he began the conquest of Persia in earnest. During the ‘Five Years’ War’ beginning 797/1395, the Muzaffarids of Fars were destroyed and the Jalāyirid Aḥmad b. Shaykh Uways driven from Iraq. Tīmūr’s northern frontier was an open one, and his great rival in the steppes was Toqtamish, Khān of the White Horde, by now supreme across the whole Qipchaq steppe of South Russia and south-western Siberia (see above, no. 134). Tīmūr accordingly invaded Qipchaq in 797/1395, penetrating as far as Astrakhan and Muscovy. But his main efforts were directed against the Islamic heartlands, where his campaigns had a cataclysmic effect on the political structures of the time. During the Indian campaign of 800/1398–9, Delhi was sacked and the end of the Tughluquids hastened (see below, no. 160, 3), facilitating in the fifteenth century the rise of independent provincial sultanates such as those of Jawnpūr, Gujarāt, Mālwa and Khāndesh (see below, Chapter Sixteen). In the west, Tīmūr’s defeat of Sultan Bāyazīd I at Ankara in 805/1402 meant the restoration for a few decades longer of many of the Anatolian *beyliks* absorbed by the Ottomans (see above, Chapter Twelve).

Before his death, which occurred just as he was about to leave for China, Tīmūr had divided up his territories among his sons and grandsons. The steppe tradition that an empire was not the personal property of the supreme ruler, but belonged to all male members of the ruling family, meant the parcelling-out of the Tīmūrid empire among its numerous princes, and in the absence of a clear succession

principle left the field open for disputes and fragmentation. Three lines of Tīmūrids are listed above, but there were several other members of the family ruling either with varying degrees of independence or as vassals of other Tīmūrids in regions as far apart as the Caspian provinces, Kirman, and Kabul and Kandahar in eastern Afghanistan. And although possession of Tīmūr's old capital Samarkand conferred prestige within the dynasty, it did not automatically entail headship or supremacy; thus Ḥusayn b. Maṣṣūr Bayqara was, in his time, the greatest ruler among the later Tīmūrids, but reigned at Herat and not Samarkand.

Once the terror inspired by Tīmūr was gone, the later Tīmūrids eventually sank to the status of local rulers in Khurasan and Transoxania, with the western lands abandoned to the rising power of Türkmen dynasties like the Qara Qoyunlu and Aq Qoyunlu (see below, nos 145, 146). At first, there were two great kingdoms, in western Persia and Iraq, and in Khurasan and Transoxania, these latter two regions being first united by Tīmūr's son Shāh Rukh and then with his suzerainty extended over the western lands as well. Shāh Rukh's great-nephew Abū Sa'īd was, next to the Ottoman Muḥammad the Conqueror, the most powerful monarch of his age, although he was unable to prevent the Özbegs, the ultimate destroyers of Tīmūrid power, from raiding across the Oxus (see below, no. 153), and his campaign of 872/1468 to help the Qara Qoyunlu against the rising power of the Aq Qoyunlu leader Uzun Ḥasan, with the hope also of regaining the former western territories of the Tīmūrids, ended in disaster.

The Tīmūrids were the last great Islamic dynasty of steppe origin. After their time, the rise of powerful settled states like those of the Ottomans, the Ṣafawids and the Mughals, all employing firearms and more advanced military techniques, tilted the balance against any further large-scale invasions by horsemen from the Inner Asian steppes. The Tīmūrid period of Transoxanian and Persian history, essentially the fifteenth century, was also one of the most glorious ones of mediaeval Islamic art and culture, with outstanding schools of Persian and Chaghatay Turkish literature and of architecture, painting and book production, and with a final flowering at the court in Herat of Ḥusayn b. Maṣṣūr b. Bayqara, where the poets Jāmī and 'Alī Shīr Nawā'ī and the painter Bihzad worked.

Justi, 472–5; Lane-Poole, 265–8; Sachau, 30–1, nos 78–83; Zambaur, 269–70 and Table T; Album, 50–3.

R. M. Savory, 'The struggle for supremacy in Persia after the death of Tīmūr', *Der Islam*, 40 (1964), 35–54.

H. R. Roemer, 'Tīmūr in Iran', 'The successors of Tīmūr', in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, VI, 42–146, with genealogical tables at p. 146.

Beatrice Forbes Manz, *The Rise and Rule of Tamerlane*, Cambridge 1989, with a genealogical table at p. 166.

Robert C. Grossman, 'A numismatic "King-List" of the Timurids', *Oriental Numismatic Society Information Sheet* no. 27, September 1990.

145

THE QARA QOYUNLU
752–874/1351–1469

Eastern Anatolia, Azerbaijan, Iraq and western Persia

- 752/1351 Bayram Khōja, vassal of the Jalāyirids in northern Iraq and eastern Anatolia
- 782/1380 Qara Muḥammad b. Türemish, nephew of Bayram Khōja, after 784/1382 independent of the Jalāyirids, k. 791/1389
- c. 792/c. 1390 Qara Yūsuf b. Qara Muḥammad, Abū Naṣr, first reign
 - 802/1400 *Invasion of Tīmūr*
 - o 809/1406 Qara Yūsuf, second reign, d. 823/1420
- o (814–21/1411–18 Pīr Budaq b. Qara Yūsuf, governor of Azerbaijan under his father's regency)
- o 823–41/1420–38 Iskandar b. Qara Yūsuf, k. 841/1438
 - (832–3/1429–30 Abū Sa'īd b. Qara Yūsuf, vassal of the Tīmūrids in Azerbaijan
 - o 836/1433 Ispan (?) b. Qara Yūsuf, Tīmūrid vassal in Iraq
 - o 837/1434 Jahān Shāh b. Qara Yūsuf, Tīmūrid vassal in eastern Anatolia)
 - o 843/1439 Jahān Shāh b. Qara Yūsuf, up to 853/1449 as a Tīmūrid vassal
 - o 872/1467 Hasan 'Alī b. Jahān Shāh
- o 873–4/1469 Abū Yūsuf b. Jahān Shāh, ruler in Fars only
 - 874/1469 *Aq Qoyunlu conquest*

The confederation of the Qara Qoyunlu '[those with] black sheep' arose out of Türkmen elements pushed westwards by the Mongol invasions. Their ruling family seems to have come from the Yīwa or Iwa clan of the Oghuz, and the seats of their power in the fourteenth century lay to the north of Lake Van and in the Mosul region of northern Iraq.

The confederation was in many ways similar to that of the Jalāyirids (see above, no. 142), and came to think of itself as the successor to the Jalāyirids, with their traditions and connections going back to Chingizid times. The first Qara Qoyunlu leaders were vassals of the older Türkmen line, until in 784/1382 Qara Muḥammad made himself independent of the Jalāyirids, basing his power on Tabriz in Azerbaijan and on eastern Anatolia. The greatest ruler of the dynasty, Qara Yūsuf, opposed Tīmūr, and had to flee first to the Ottomans and then to Mamlūk Syria, only returning in 809/1406 and then ending the power of the Jalāyirids in Azerbaijan and Iraq. Qara Yūsuf now undertook warfare against his Aq Qoyunlu rivals (see below, no. 146) in Diyār Bakr, against the Georgians and the later Shīrwān Shāhs (see above, no. 67, 2) in the Caucasus, and against the Tīmūrid suzerains in western Persia. Once the forceful Shāh Rukh was dead, Jahān Shāh extended his rule to Fars, Kirman and even Oman, and made the Qara Qoyunlu an imperial power, adopting for himself such titles as *khān* and *sultān*. Finally, he attacked the redoubtable Aq Qoyunlu ruler Uzun Hasan, but was defeated and lost his life. His son Hasan 'Alī was unable to secure his position as

leader of the Qara Qoyunlu, and killed himself in 873/1469, so that all the Qara Qoyunlu territories passed into the hands of the Aq Qoyunlu.

The constituting of the Qara Qoyunlu confederation was part of the interlude of Türkmen domination over the central part of the northern tier of the Middle East, from Anatolia to Khurasan, during the period between the decay of the Il Khānids and the rise of the Ottomans, Şafawids and Özbegs. Ethnically, the rule of Türkmens accelerated the process, already well advanced, whereby Azerbaijan and parts of Fars became strongly Turkish in race and speech. As to the religious affiliations of the Qara Qoyunlu, although some of the later members of the family had Shī'ī-type names and there were occasional Shī'ī coin legends, there seems no strong evidence for definite Shī'ī sympathies beyond possible influences from a general climate of such sympathies among many Türkmen elements of the time.

Lane-Poole, 253; Zambaur, 257; Album, 53.

IA 'Kara-Koyunlular' (Faruk Sümer), with a detailed genealogical table; EP² 'Karā-Ḳoyunlu' (F. Sümer), with a detailed genealogical table.

R. M. Savory, 'The struggle for supremacy in Persia after the death of Tīmūr', 35-50.

Faruk Sümer, *Kara-Koyunlular (başlangıştan Cihan-Şah'a kadar)*, I, Ankara 1967.

H. R. Roemer, 'The Türkmen dynasties', in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, VI, 150-74.

146

THE AQ QOYUNLU
798–914/1396–1508

*Diyār Bakr, Eastern Anatolia, Azerbaijan and, later, western Persia,
Fars and Kirman*

- c. 761/c. 1360 Qutlugh b. Tūr 'Alī b. Pahlawān, Fakhr al-Dīn
- 791/1389 Aḥmad b. Qutlugh, nominal head of the confederation until 805/1403
- o 805/1403 Qara Yoluq 'Uthmān b. Qutlugh, Fakhr al-Dīn, *de facto* head of the confederation since 798/1396
- o 839/1435 'Alī b. Qara 'Uthmān, Jalāl al-Dīn, in dispute with his brothers Ḥamza and Ya'qūb
- o 841/1438 Ḥamza b. Qara 'Uthmān, Nūr al-Dīn, in dispute with Ya'qūb and Ja'far b. Ya'qūb
- o 848/1444 Jahāngīr b. 'Alī, Mu'izz al-Dīn
- (855–6/1451–2 Qīlich Arslan b. Aḥmad b. Qutlugh, in eastern Anatolia)
- o 861/1457 Uzun Ḥasan b. 'Alī, Abu 'l-Naṣr
- o 882/1478 Sulṭān Khalīl b. Uzun Ḥasan, Abu 'l-Faṭḥ
- o 883/1478 Ya'qūb b. Uzun Ḥasan, Abu 'l-Muẓaffar
- o 896/1490 Baysonqur b. Ya'qūb, Abu 'l-Faṭḥ, in dispute with Masīḥ Mīrzā b. Uzun Ḥasan, k. 896/1491
- o 898/1493 Rustam b. Maqṣūd b. Uzun Ḥasan, Abu 'l-Muẓaffar
- o 902/1497 Aḥmad Gōvde b. Ughurlu Muḥammad b. Uzun Ḥasan, Abu 'l-Naṣr
- o 903/1497 Alwand b. Yūsuf b. Uzun Ḥasan, Abu 'l-Muẓaffar, in Diyār Bakr and then in Azerbaijan until 908/1502, d. 910/1504
- o 903/1497 Muḥammadi b. Yūsuf b. Uzun Ḥasan, Abu 'l-Makārim, in Iraq and southern Persia, k. 905/1500
- o 905–14/1500–8 Sulṭān Murād b. Ya'qūb b. Uzun Ḥasan, Abu 'l-Muẓaffar, in Fars and Kirman until 914/1508, d. 920/1514
- o 910–14/1504–8 Zayn al-'Ābidīn b. Aḥmad b. Ughurlu Muḥammad, in Diyār Bakr
- 914/1508 *Ṣafawid conquest*

The Aq Qoyunlu '[those with] white sheep' were a nomadic confederation of Türkmens centred on Diyār Bakr, with their ruling stratum drawn from the ancient Oghuz clan of the Bayundur. Already in the mid-fourteenth century they were raiding the Byzantine principality of Trebizond and were able to force marriage alliances on the Greek rulers. It was from the Türkmén-Byzantine marriage of 753/1352 that there arose the real founder of the confederation's fortunes, Qara Yoluq 'Uthmān, and relations between the two powers remained close for a century. Unlike their rivals the Qara Qoyunlu (see above, no. 145), the Aq Qoyunlu submitted to Timūr, and Qara 'Uthmān fought for him against the Ottoman Bāyazīd I at Ankara, being rewarded by the grant of Diyār Bakr. Expansion eastwards was blocked first by the Jalāyirids (see above, no. 142) and then by the Qara Qoyunlu, but Uzun Ḥasan, a military commander and

statesman of genius, at last crushed Jahān Shāh in 872/1467 and incorporated many of the Qara Qoyunlu sub-tribes into his own horde, and after defeating the Tīmūrid Abū Sa'īd was able to extend his rule as far as Khurasan and down to Iraq and the Persian Gulf shores.

Uzun Ḥasan's prime enemy in the west was, however, the Ottomans, who were at this time mopping up the remaining *beyliks* of Anatolia (see above, Chapter Twelve) and pressing eastwards. Anti-Ottoman common interest made him ally with the Qaramānids (see above, no. 124), and he also tried to save Trebizond, to whose rulers he was related through his Byzantine wife Despina, from the attacks of Muḥammad the Conqueror. The Aq Qoyunlu were now a power of international significance. In 868/1464, diplomatic relations were opened up with the Ottomans' Venetian enemies, and arms and munitions were despatched from Venice via southern Anatolia. Yet Uzun Ḥasan's cavalymen were no match for Ottoman firepower at Tercan (Terjān) in 878/1473, and the Aq Qoyunlu leader was crushingly defeated. His son Ya'qūb carried on the struggle, but the dynasty went into a terminal period of division, internecine strife and succession disputes. The Qaramānids had fallen to the Ottomans, and, despite the fact that there had been a marriage link between Uzun Ḥasan and the head of the Ṣafawiyya order, Shaykh Junayd (see below, no. 148), Shī'ī propaganda was being spread among the Sunnī Aq Qoyunlu's Türkmen followers in eastern Anatolia. In 906/1501, Alwand was defeated by the Ṣafawid Shāh Ismā'il I, and the last Aq Qoyunlu, Sultān Murād, was forced to flee to the Ottomans. The dynasty's rule was now finished everywhere, but had left behind in such places as Uzun Ḥasan's capital at Tabriz a distinguished tradition of cultural and literary patronage.

Lane-Poole, 254; Zambaur, 258–9; Album, 53–4.

IA 'Ak Qoyunlular' (M. H. Yinanç), with a genealogical table; EI² 'Ak Qoyunlu' (V. Minorsky).

R. M. Savory, 'The struggle for supremacy in Persia after the death of Tīmūr', 50–65.

John E. Woods, *The Aqqyunlu. Clan, Confederation, Empire. A Study in 15th/9th Century Turko-Iranian Politics*, Minneapolis and Chicago 1976, with Appendix C of genealogical tables.

H. R. Roemer, in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, VI, 147–88.

- 839/1435 Sayyid Muḥammad b. Falāḥ b. Haybat Allāh, *walī* of the
Mahdi or Twelfth Imām, d. 870/1466, first period of rule
(857-61/1453-7) Sayyid Sulṭān 'Alī b. Muḥammad, as his father's deputy)
861/1457 Sayyid Muḥammad b. Falāḥ, second period of rule
870/1466 Sayyid Sulṭān Muḥsin b. Muḥammad, d. 905/1500 or c.
914/c. 1508
 ? Sayyid Falāḥ b. Muḥsin, d. 920/1514
920/1514 Sayyid Badrān b. Falāḥ, Shujā' al-Dīn, d. soon after 988/1580
c. 988/c. 1580 Sayyid Sajjād b. Badrān
before 992/1584 Sayyid 'Alī b. Sajjād
992/1584 Sayyid Zunbūr 'Alī b. 'Alī, in Khūzistān until 998/1590
995/1587 Sayyid Mubārak b. ('Abd al-) Muṭṭalib b. Badrān, in
Huwayza, with the additional title of Khān
1025/1616 Sayyid Naṣir b. Mubārak
1025/1616 Sayyid Rāshid b. Salīm b. Muṭṭalib, k. shortly after his
appointment
1030/1621 Sayyid Manṣūr b. Muṭṭalib, first governorship
1033/1624 Sayyid Muḥammad b. Mubārak
after 1042/1632 Sayyid Manṣūr, second governorship
1053/1643 Sayyid Baraka b. Manṣūr
1060/1650 Sayyid 'Alī b. Khalaf b. Muṭṭalib, d. 1092/1681
1097/1686 Sayyid Ḥaydar (? or 'Abdallāh) b. Khalaf
1097/1686 Sayyid Faraj Allāh b. 'Alī
1112/1700 Sayyid 'Alī, nephew of Faraj Allāh, first governorship
1114/1707 Sayyid 'Abdallāh b. Faraj Allāh
1127/1715 Sayyid 'Alī, second governorship
1132/1720 Sayyid Muḥammad b. 'Abdallāh
1150/1737 Sayyid Faraj Allāh, in Dawraq, until 1160/1747
1060/1747 Sayyid Muṭṭalib b. Muḥammad, in Huwayza, k. 1176/1762
 ? Sayyid Mawlā Jūd Allāh, cousin of Muṭṭalib
 ? Sayyid Mawlā Ismā'il
c. 1193/c. 1779 Sayyid Mawlā Muḥsin b. Jūd Allāh
 ? Sayyid Mawlā Muḥammad b. Jūd Allāh
after 1212/1797 Sayyid Mawlā Muṭṭalib b. Muḥammad
 ? Sayyid Mawlā 'Abd al-'Alī
1257/1841 Sayyid Mawlā Faraj Allāh, governor of Khūzistān
1289/1872 Sayyid Mawlā Muḥammad b. Naṣr Allāh
1298/1881 Sayyid Mawlā Muṭṭalib b. Naṣr Allāh, after c. 1312/c. 1895
in Dizfūl
c. 1305/c. 1888 Sayyid Mawlā Naṣr Allāh, in Huwayza
 ? Sayyid Mawlā 'Abd al-'Alī, to 1328/1910

1328-42/1910-24 Musha'sha'ī nominee in Huwayza of Shaykh Khaz'al of Muḥammara

1342/1924 Restoration of 'Abd al-'Alī as Shaykh of Huwayza by Riḍā Khān

The Musha'sha'ī movement arose in the fifteenth century in southern Khūzistān, in the region which in more recent times has come to be known as 'Arabistān. Although this region at the head of the Persian Gulf was ethnically Arab, it became the home of a typically Persia extremist Shī'ī millenarian movement; and the Musha'sha' family, throughout nearly 500 years of its existence, was always linked politically with the rulers of Persia rather than with those in Iraq (latterly, in fact, the Ottomans). Sayyid Muḥammad b. Falāḥ proclaimed his *zuhūr* or manifestation as the *hijāb* or 'shield' of the Expected Imām, in opposition to the Qara Qoyunlu rulers of Iraq (see above, no. 145); the name Musha'sha' seems to have connotations (cf. *shu'ā'* 'ray of light') of illuminationism, a perceptible strain within Shī'ism as it was to develop in Ṣafawid Persia.

During the fifteenth century, the Musha'sha' were independent local rulers based on Huwayza or Hawīza, and this was their heyday as a religio-political movement. Once the Ṣafawid Shāh Ismā'īl I (see below, no. 148) had extended his power into Khūzistān in 920/1514, the Musha'sha' were reduced to submission, and over the next centuries generally functioned as *wālīs* or governors for the Persian monarchs. At the end of the nineteenth century, their local influence was overshadowed by the rise of the rulers of Muḥammara from the Arab Banū Kalb, but the Musha'sha' family nevertheless managed to survive up to the time of Riḍā Shāh Pahlawī (see below, no. 152).

Album, 54.

*ET*² 'Musha'sha'' (P. Luft).

W. Caskel, 'Ein Mahdi des 15. Jahrhunderts. Saijid Muḥammad ibn Falāḥ und seine Nachkommen', *Islamica*, 4 (1931), 48-93, with a genealogical stem at p. 75.

idem, 'Die Wālī's von Huwēzeh', *Islamica*, 6 (1934), 415-34, with a genealogical stem and list at pp. 424-32.

907–1135/1501–1722, thereafter as *fainéants* and pretenders until 1179/1765
Persia

- 907/1501 Ismā'il I b. Haydar b. Junayd, Abu 'l-Muẓaffar
- 930/1524 Tahmāsp I b. Ismā'il I
- 984/1576 Ismā'il II b. Tahmāsp I
- 985/1578 Muḥammad Khudābanda b. Tahmāsp I, d. 1003/1595 or
1004/1596
- 995/1587 'Abbās I b. Muḥammad Khudābanda
- 1038/1629 Şafi I, Sām Mirzā b. Şafi Mirzā
- 1052/1642 'Abbās II, Sulṭān Muḥammad Mirzā b. Şafi I
- 1077/1666 Şafi II b. 'Abbās II, re-enthroned in 1078/1668 as
Sulaymān I
- 1105/1694 Husayn I b. Sulaymān I, Mullā
1135/1722 *Afghan invasion*
- 1135/1722 Tahmāsp II b. Husayn I, k. 1153/1740
- 1145/1732 'Abbās III b. Tahmāsp II, k. 1153/1740
1148/1736 *Nādir Shāh Afshār*
1161/1748 *Shāh Rukh, Afshārid, first reign*
- 1163/1750 Sulaymān II, Sayyid Muḥammad, grandson of Sulaymān
I, at Mashhad
1163/1750 *Shāh Rukh, second reign, in Khurāsān*
- 1163–79/1750–65 Ismā'il III b. Sayyid Murtaḍā, Abū Turāb, in Işfahān as a
puppet of the Zands, d. 1187/1773

The origins of the Şafawids are obscure, and their elucidation is not helped by the production, by at least the first half of the sixteenth century, of an 'official' version of Şafawid genealogy and early history. It does, however, seem probable that they hailed from Persian Kurdistan, and, as Turkish speakers, they seem to be part of the Türkmen resurgence of post-Mongol times. The family headed a Şūfī order, the Şafawiyya, based on Ardabil in Azerbaijan, originally orthodox Sunnī in complexion, but in the mid-fifteenth century the leader of the order, Shaykh Junayd, embarked on a campaign for material power in addition to spiritual authority. In the atmosphere of heterodoxy and Shī'ī sympathies among the Türkmen of Anatolia and Azerbaijan, the Şafawiyya gradually became Shī'ī in emphasis.

The political ambitions of the first Şafawids brought them up against the other Türkmen powers of eastern Anatolia, Iraq and Persia, but in 905/1501 Ismā'il I defeated the Aq Qoyunlu (see above, no. 146), seized Azerbaijan and brought the whole of Persia under his control during the ensuing ten years, and thus established the Şafawid theocracy, for not only did Ismā'il and his successors claim to be lineal descendants of 'Alī through the Seventh Imām Mūsā al-Kāzim, but Ismā'il, at least, on the evidence of his poetry, also claimed divine status in the extremist Shī'ī *ghulāt* tradition. Their Türkmen tribal followers, the so-called *Qizil Bash* or 'red heads' (from the red caps which they wore) thus owed

a spiritual as well as a political allegiance. Shī'ism was imposed as the state religion on a country which up until then had been, at least officially, predominantly Sunnī. The Ṣafawid period is thus of supreme importance in Persian history because of this consolidation of Shī'ism there; in the process, Persia acquired a new sense of solidarity and nationhood which enabled her to survive into modern times with her national spirit and the integrity of Persian territory substantially unimpaired.

Militarily, the early Ṣafawids had to face the strenuous hostility of their Sunnī neighbours, the Ottomans in the west and the Özbegs in the north-east. On the north-eastern frontier, the Shāhs just managed to hold their own, with cities like Herat, Mashhad and Sarakhs frequently changing hands; but Türkmen incursions for plunder and slaves continued well into the nineteenth century. The Ottomans were especially dangerous, being at the peak of their military strength in the sixteenth century. Sultan Selīm I's victory over the Ṣafawids at Chāldirān in 920/1514 was a triumph of logistics and superior firepower for the Ottomans (like the Mamlūks of Egypt, the Ṣafawids were slow to adopt artillery and hand-guns), and also impaired the Ṣafawids' supporters' beliefs in the divine invincibility of their masters. Soon afterwards, Kurdistan, Diyār Bakr and Baghdad passed into Ottoman hands, and Azerbaijan was frequently invaded; later, the Ṣafawid capital was moved from vulnerable Tabriz to Qazwin and then to Iṣfahān.

The reign of Shāh 'Abbās I, near-contemporary of such great rulers as Elizabeth I of England, Philip II of Spain, Ivan IV ('The Terrible') of Russia and the Mughal emperor Akbar, marks the apex of Ṣafawid military power and also Ṣafawid culture and civilisation, some of whose manifestations are visible in the architectural glories of Iṣfahān. During his reign, the Ottomans were ejected from Azerbaijan, and Persian control over the Caucasus and the Gulf strengthened. Diplomatic contacts with Europe were established (although a Ṣafawid-European grand alliance against the Ottomans never materialised), and commercial and cultural contacts grew. In order to counteract the influence in the state of the *Qizil Bash*, 'Abbās recruited Georgian and Circassian converts as slave guards, and favoured the formation of a group of Türkmen owing allegiance to himself personally and not to the tribal chiefs (the *Shāh seven* or 'Lovers of the Shāh').

After the death of Shāh 'Abbās II in 1077/1666, there was a perceptible decline in the personal qualities of the rulers. Ṣafawid authority had at times stretched as far as eastern Afghanistan, but Sunnī Afghan sentiment was opposed to the strongly Shī'ī policies of the Shāhs, and in the early eighteenth century the governor for the Ṣafawids there, Mīr Uways, declared himself independent. In 1135/1722, his son Maḥmūd invaded Persia; Ṣafawid resistance collapsed, and for several years until the rise of Nādir Shāh Afshār (see below, no. 149), the Ghilzay Afghans occupied much of Persia. The subsequent holders of power in Persia at times felt a need to nominate Ṣafawid descendants or claimants as puppet rulers, but the effective rule of the dynasty disappeared with Tahmāsp II.

Justi, 479; Lane-Poole, 255–9; Zambaur, 261–2; Abum, 54–7.

EP² 'Ṣafawids. 1. Dynastic, political and military history' (R. M. Savory).

J. R. Perry, 'The last Ṣafavids, 1722–1773', *Iran*, *JBIS*, 9 (1971), 59–69.

Roger Savory, *Iran under the Safavids*, Cambridge 1980.

H. R. Roemer, 'The Safavid period', in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, VI, 189–350.

149

THE AFSHĀRIDS
1148–1210/1736–96
Persia

- 1148/1736 Nadr Qulī b. Imām Qulī, Tahmāsp Qulī, Nādir Shāh Afshār, since 1144/1732 regent for Shāh Tahmāsp II
- 1160/1747 ‘Alī Qulī b. Muḥammad Ibrāhīm b. Imām Qulī, ‘Ādil Shāh, k. 1160/1747
- 1161/1748 Ibrāhīm b. Muḥammad Ibrāhīm, in central and western Persia
- 1163/1750 Shāh Rukh b. Riḍā Qulī b. Nādir Shāh, in Khurasan, first reign, deposed 1163/1750
- 1163/1750 Shāh Rukh, second reign
- 1168–1210/1755–96 Shāh Rukh, third reign, at first as the puppet of the Abdālī or Durrānī Afghans
- 1210/1796 *Succession of the Qājārs*
- (1210–18/1796–1803 Nādir Mirzā b. Shāh Rukh, holder of power in Mashhad)

Nadr or Nādir was a chieftain of the Afshār, a Türkmen tribe settled in northern Khurasan; it was in this home territory that he later constructed his stronghold and treasury, the Qal‘at-i Nādirī. In this period of Ṣafawid decay, when much of Persia was in the hands of the Ghilzays, the national unity of Persia, which had been built up by the earlier Ṣafawids, seemed likely to disintegrate. It was to be Nādir’s achievement temporarily to restore the territorial integrity of Persia, albeit at the price of leaving the country financially and economically exhausted. His ascent to power began through service with the ineffective Ṣafawid Shāh Tahmāsp II (whence the name which he adopted, ‘slave of Tahmāsp’). He began systematically to clear the Afghan invaders from Persia, and when by 1140/1727 this had been achieved, the Shāh rewarded him with the governorship of Khurasan, Kirman, Sistan and Māzandarān. With such extensive lands under his personal control, Nādir began to act like an independent ruler, now minting his own coins. Turning to external enemies, he drove the Ottomans out of Azerbaijan and Kurdistan, and penetrated through the Caucasus as far as Dāghistān. Tahmāsp’s conclusion of a treaty with Turkey and Russia unfavourable to Persia’s interests provided Nādir with a pretext to depose him, setting up another Ṣafawid prince as puppet ruler, until in 1148/1736 he was himself proclaimed Shāh. Nādir seems at this point to have sought an end to the ancient Shī‘ī–Sunni hostility between Persia and Turkey, and he announced the abandonment of Twelver Shī‘ism as the state religion and the establishment instead of much-attenuated form of Shī‘ism whose spiritual head was to be the Sixth Imām, Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq; in practice, this conciliatory move pleased no-one and did not bring about détente with the Ottomans.

The expense of continual warfare drove Nādir into his brilliantly successful Indian campaign of 1151–2/1738–9, as a result of which the Mughal emperor Muḥammad Shāh (see below, no. 175) had to cede all his provinces north and west of the Indus and to pay an enormous tribute; because of this last, Nādir declared

the people of Persia exempt from taxation for three years. An assassination attempt on him in 1154/1741, in which Nādir suspected the complicity of his son Riḍā Qulī, caused a deterioration in his character, so that his policies became more and more cruel and erratic. Rebellions broke out in the provinces against his exactions, and in 1160/1747 a group of Afshār and Qājār Tūrkmēn chiefs finally murdered him. Two of his nephews reigned briefly, and then his blinded grandson Shāh Rukh ruled as a puppet of military commanders in Khurasan, until Agha Muḥammad Qājār (see below, no. 151) extended his power eastwards from northern Persia in 1210/1796 and ended what remained of the authority of the Afshārids.

Lane-Poole, 257–9; Zambaur, 261; Album, 57–8.

*EI*² 'Nādir Shāh Afshār' (J. R. Perry).

Peter Avery, 'Nādir Shāh and the Afsharid legacy', in *The Cambridge History of Iran*. VII. *From Nadir Shah to the Islamic Republic*, Cambridge 1991, 3–62.

150

THE ZANDS
1164–1209/1751–94
Persia, excepting Khurasan

- 1164/1751 Muḥammad Karīm Khān b. Inaq Khān, as *wakīl* or regent for Ismā'īl III Ṣafawī
- 1193/1779 Abu 'l-Faṭḥ b. Muḥammad Karīm } nominal rulers
Muḥammad 'Alī b. Muḥammad Karīm } in Shiraz
- 1193/1779 Muḥamad Ṣādiq b. Inaq, in Shiraz
- 1195/1781 'Alī Murād b. Allāh Murād or Qaydar Khān, in Isfahan
- 1199/1785 Ja'far b. Muḥammad Ṣādiq, at first in Isfahan, latterly in Shiraz
- 1204–9/1789–94 Luṭf 'Alī b. Ja'far, in Shiraz
- 1209/1794 *Succession of the Qājārs*

In the chaos which followed Nādir Shāh's death, various military chiefs seized power in the provinces of Persia. His Afghan commander Aḥmad Abdālī founded in Kandahar an important Afghan state, whose territories included Nādir's conquests in north-western India (see below, no. 175). In Khurasan, the Afshārid Shāh Rukh retained a precarious power as the puppet of local commanders. In the Caspian provinces, the Qājārs maintained their power-base (see below, no. 151), while in Azerbaijan another of Nādir's Afghan generals, Āzād, established himself. In southern Persia, the main force was initially the Bakhtiyārī leader 'Alī Mardān, who had taken Isfahan and raised to the throne there a *fainéant* Ṣafawid, Ismā'īl III (1163/1750) (see above, no. 148). 'Alī Mardān's lieutenant and *sardār* or commander of the forces was Muḥammad Karīm Zand, from a minor tribe of Lurs in the central Zagros Mountains; and when 'Alī was murdered, Muḥammad Karīm made himself sole ruler in southern Persia.

He still had a lengthy struggle with the Qājār Muḥammad Hasan Khān before his authority over the greater part of Persia outside Khurasan was made firm. Muḥammad Karīm never himself assumed the title of Shāh, but reigned from Shiraz as *wakīl al-dawla* or regent for Ismā'īl III. His reign of almost thirty years was one of clemency and moderation, and the land flourished under his enlightened rule; among other things, commercial relations with Britain via Bushire (Būshahr) on the Persia Gulf were encouraged. But his death was the signal for disastrous succession disputes to break out within the Zand family. 'Alī Murād finally secured the throne, but died soon afterwards, and in the reign of Ja'far the power of the Zands' rivals the Qājārs grew until the Zands had to abandon Isfahan to them. The last Zand, Luṭf 'Alī Khān, a popular ruler and an able general, took up arms against the Qājārs and was successful for a while. But in 1209/1794 he was captured at Kirmān by Agha Muḥammad Khān Qājār and brutally murdered; the whole of Persia now became united under one monarch for the first time since the brief career of Nādir Shāh and the heyday of the Ṣafawids.

Lane-Poole, 260, 262; Zambaur, 261, 264; Album, 58–9.

John R. Perry, *Karim Khan Zand. A History of Iran, 1747–1779*, Chicago and London 1979, with a genealogical table at p. 296.
idem, 'The Zand dynasty', in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, VII, 63–103, and Gavin R. G. Hambly, 'Āghā Muḥammad Khān and the establishment of the Qājār dynasty', in *ibid.*, 104–26, with a genealogical table at p. 961.

151

THE QĀJĀRS 1193–1344/1779–1925 *Persia*

- | | | |
|-------------------|--|--|
| | Fath 'Alī Khān, k. 1139/1726 | } tribal chiefs in
Gurgān and
Māzandarān |
| | o Muḥammad Ḥasan b. Fath 'Alī,
k. 1172/1759 | |
| | Husayn Qulī b. Muḥammad | |
| | Husayn, Jahānsūz, d. 1191/1777 | |
| o 1193/1779 | Agha Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Ḥasan, ruler in north-
ern and central Persia, after 1209/1794 ruler in south-
ern Persia also, after 1210/1796 ruler in Khurasan also | |
| o 1212/1797 | Fath 'Alī b. Husayn Qulī, Bābā Khān | |
| o 1250/1834 | Muḥammad b. 'Abbās Mīrza b. Fath 'Alī | |
| o 1264/1848 | Nāṣir al-Dīn b. Muḥammad | |
| o 1313/1896 | Muẓaffar al-Dīn b. Nāṣir al-Dīn | |
| o 1324/1907 | Muḥammad 'Alī b. Muẓaffar al-Dīn, d. 1343/1925 | |
| o 1327–44/1909–25 | Aḥmad b. Muḥammad 'Alī, d. 1347/1929 | |
| | 1344/1925 <i>Succession of the Pahlawīs</i> | |

The Qājār tribe of Türkmens had probably been settled near Astarābād in the Caspian coastlands since Mongol times; later, they were one of the seven great Türkmens tribes supporting the early Ṣafawids and comprising the *Qizil Bash*. With the disintegration of the Ṣafawid empire in the early eighteenth century, the Qājārs began to play a more-than-local part in Persian affairs. The chiefs of the Qoyunlu clan of the Qājārs expanded across northern Persia in an endeavour to take over Nādir Shāh's western territories, but it was not until 1209/1794 that Agha Muḥammad was finally victorious over the Zands (see above, no. 150); soon afterwards, Persian suzerainty was re-established, albeit temporarily, over Georgia, and the last Afshārid removed from Khurasan (see above, no. 149). The frightful Agha Muḥammad, whose excesses are doubtless in part explicable by the fact that, as a boy, he had been castrated by Nādir's nephew 'Adil Shāh, was thus the founder of the dynasty under which Persia was to move definitely into the modern world, acquiring an important strategic and economic rôle in the international states-system. It was also under the first Qājār Shāh that Tehran (Tīhrān), previously a town of only modest importance, became the capital (1200/1786); in this way began the movement of all life towards the centre which has characterised modern Persia.

Regular diplomatic relations with the European powers date from Fath 'Alī Shāh's reign, when Persia was courted by Britain on one side and by Napoleonic France on the other on account of her strategic position across the routes to the East. A by-product of this attention from the West was the introduction of European techniques and training into the Persian army. This was all the more necessary for Persia in that, during the nineteenth century, Imperial Russia, advancing now into the Caucasus and into Central Asia, was a continuing threat; by the humiliating Treaty of Turkmanchay in 1243/1828, Persia had had to

relinquish all claims to territories in eastern Armenia and the Caucasus and had had to facilitate Russian commercial penetration of Persia. For their part, the Qājārs were for long reluctant to renounce the heritage of eastern conquests made by the Šafawids and by Nādir, and disputes with Afghanistan continued until the later nineteenth century (see below, no. 180).

Through the mutual rivalries of the European powers and the astuteness of Nāšir al-Dīn Shāh, the geographically-compact land of Persia was much more successful than the disparate Ottoman empire in maintaining its territorial integrity. Nevertheless, the cost of warfare and royal extravagance were plunging the nation deeply into foreign indebtedness, thereby increasing the economic stranglehold of the European creditor nations. During the reign of Muzaffar al-Dīn Shāh, there arose a movement demanding some degree of political liberalism and the granting of a constitution, demands which had to be met in 1906. The prestige and power of the Qājārs were now perceptibly failing. During the First World War, Persia remained officially neutral, but despite this, Turkish, Russian and British troops fought over her soil, and, at the end of the war, various local rebellions and separatist movements arose in the provinces. Accordingly, it was not difficult for a decisive military leader like Riḍā Khan to get the National Assembly to depose the Qājārs in 1925 (see below, no. 152).

Lane-Poole, 260; Zambaur, 261–3; Album, 59–61.

*EP*² 'Qājār' (A. K. S Lambton).

Gavin R. G. Hambly, 'Āghā Muḥammad Khān and the establishment of the Qājār dynasty', *idem*, 'Iran during the reigns of Fath 'Alī Shāh and Muḥammad Shāh', and Nikki Keddie and Mehrdad Amanat, 'Iran under the later Qājārs, 1848–1922', in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, VII, 104–212, with a genealogical table at p. 962.

THE PAHLAWĪS
1344–98/1925–79
Persia

- o 1344/1925 Riḍā b. ‘Abbās ‘Alī, d. 1365/1944
o 1360–98/1941–79 Muḥammad b. Riḍā, d. 1399/1980
1398/1979 *Islamic Republic*

Riḍā Khān was a soldier in the Persian army who had participated in the *coup d'état* of 1921 which began the process of the ousting of the Qājārs (see above, no. 151). In December 1925, the *Majlis* or National Assembly voted him in as Shāh in succession to Aḥmad Qājār, who had left the country two years previously; Riḍā had already assumed the family name of Pahlawī, redolent of ancient Persian glories.

Riḍā's sixteen-year rule in many ways resembled other military dictatorships which emerged in both the Middle East (such as that of Muṣṭafā Kemāl Atatürk in Turkey) and Europe. His driving aim was the modernisation of his country so that it could stand on its own feet against outside pressures, and this involved the centralisation of power and the bureaucratisation of many aspects of Persian life. During his reign, the country made immense strides in industrialisation, the provision of modern communications and the introduction of modern, secular educational and legal systems; but all this was at the price of individual liberty and freedom of expression. Riḍā Shāh's pro-German stance in the early part of the Second World War led to his deposition under British and Russian pressure and his replacement by his son Muḥammad. Muḥammad wished to continue his father's policies, but was involved in disputes with his *Majlis* and with both nationalist and communist factions. Educational and land reforms were nevertheless successful while Persia was benefiting from rising oil revenues, but after 1975 lower oil prices brought inflation and economic hardship to the country. Popular discontent was utilised by a wide spectrum of opposition forces, including the Shī'ī clergy, and, unwilling to use military force against his own people, the Shāh, already very sick, left his throne for exile in January 1979. The Pahlawī monarchy was then replaced by an Islamic Republic hostile to virtually everything which the Pahlawīs had sought to achieve.

*Et*² 'Muḥammad Riḍā Shāh Pahlawī' (R. M. Savory), 'Riḍā Shāh' (G. R. G. Hambly).
Gavin R. G. Hambly, 'The Pahlavī autocracy: Rīzā Shāh, 1921–1941', *idem*, 'The Pahlavī autocracy: Muḥammad Rīzā Shāh, 1941–1979', in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, VII, 213–93.

FIFTEEN

Central Asia after the Mongols

153

THE SHĪBĀNIDS (SHAYBĀNIDS) OR ABU 'L-KHAYRIDS
906–1007/1500–99

Transoxania and northern Afghanistan

- c. 842–72/c. 1438–68 Abu 'l-Khayr b. Dawlat Shaykh b. Ibrāhīm, khān at Tura (Tiumen) in Western Siberia, then ruler also in northern Khwārazm
- o 906/1500 Muḥammad Shībānī b. Shāh Budaq b. Abi 'l-Khayr, Abu 'l-Faṭḥ, Shāh Beg Özbeg, conqueror of Transoxania, k. 916/1510
 - o 918/1512 Köchkunju Muḥammad b. Abi 'l-Khayr
 - o 937/1531 Abū Sa'id b. Köchkunju, Muzaffar al-Dīn
 - o 940/1534 'Ubaydallāh b. Maḥmūd b. Shāh Budaq, Abu 'l-Ghāzī
 - o 946/1539 'Abdallāh I b. Köchkunju
 - o 947/1540 'Abd al-Laṭīf b. Köchkunju
 - o 959/1552 Nawrūz Aḥmad or Baraq b. Sunjuq b. Abi 'l-Khayr
 - o 963/1556 Pīr Muḥammad I b. Jānī Beg, great-grandson of Abu 'l-Khayr
 - o 968/1561 Iskandar b. Jānī Beg
 - o 991/1583 'Abdallāh II b. Iskandar
 - o 1006/1598 'Abd al-Mu'min b. 'Abdallāh II
 - o 1006–7/1598–9 Pīr Muḥammad II b. Sulaymān b. Jānī Beg
 - 1007/1599 *Succession in Bukhārā of the Toqay Temūrids or Jānids, descendants of the Khāns of Astrakhan*

When Toqtamīsh and his White Horde moved westwards and united with the Golden Horde in South Russia, Western Siberia fell to the descendants of Jochi's youngest son Shīban. Later, these descendants came to be known as the Shībānids (Arabised, perhaps with a hope of suggesting a fictitious connection with the ancient Arab tribe of Shaybān of Bakr, as Shaybānids). One branch of them remained in Siberia as Khāns of Tura or Tūmen (Tiumen) until extinguished in the late sixteenth century, but much of the Horde of Shīban moved into Transoxania, where its members acquired the name of Özbegs (presumably after the famous Golden Horde Khān Muḥammad Özbeg, 713–42/1313–41, see above, no. 134), becoming the progenitors of the greater part of the indigenous inhabitants of the present-day Uzbek Republic.

Abu 'l-Khayr took over northern Khwārazm and unsuccessfully attacked the Tīmūrids (see above, no. 144) in Transoxania, but his grandson Muḥammad conquered Transoxania by 906/1500 from the last Tīmūrids and temporarily occupied Khurasan also. This last was retaken by Shāh Ismā'il Ṣafawī (see above, no. 148), but for much of the sixteenth century the Sunnī orthodox Shībānids

carried on warfare against the Shī'ī Ṣafawids of Persia, and their alliance was courted by other Sunnī empires such as those of the Ottomans and the Mughals of India. The Shībānīd khanate in fact formed a loose family confederacy, with powerful appanages granted out by the ruling supreme khān to various junior members. These appanages were centred upon Balkh, Bukhara, Tashkent and Samarkand, and these local centres became the capital of the whole khanate when their holders moved up and became recognised as supreme ruler.

Abu 'l-Khayrīd power reached its peak under 'Abdallāh II b. Iskandar, effective ruler for nearly forty years, under whom Transoxania experienced much cultural and commercial progress. This Shībānīd clan ruled until 1007/1599, when its last member, Pīr Muḥammad II, was killed by his rival for control of Transoxania, Bāqī Muḥammad b. Jānī Muḥammad, a descendant of Jochi's son Orda and a connection of the Shībānīds in the female line. The family of Bāqī Muḥammad, the Toqay Temūrīds or Jānīds, then assumed power in Bukhara (see below, no. 154).

However, a collateral line of Shībānīds, the 'Arabshāhīds, ruled in Khwārazm during this period. These were the descendants of 'Arabshāh b. Pūlād, Pūlād being the great-grandfather of Abu 'l-Khayr. One of them, Ilbars b. Būreke, became khān at Ürgench in 917/1511. The 'Arabshāhīds soon controlled the whole of Khwārazm as far south as northern Khurasan. In c. 1008/c. 1600 the khāns moved their capital to Khiva (Khīwa), and thus there began the khanate of that name which was to endure until the early twentieth century; the 'Arabshāhīd line itself seems to have ended around the end of the seventeenth or the beginning of the eighteenth century.

Lane-Poole, 238–40, 270–3; Zambaur, 270–1, 274–5; Album, 62–3.

*El*¹ 'Shāibānī Khān' (W. Barthold), *El*² 'Shībānīds' (R. D. McChesney); *Elr* 'Arabshāhī' (Y. Bregel), 'Central Asia. VI. In the 10th–12th/16th–18th centuries' (Robert D. McChesney), with a genealogical table of the Abu 'l-Khayrīds.

W. Barthold, *Histoire des Turcs d'Asie Centrale*, Paris 1945, 184–8.

N. M. Lowick, 'Shaybānīd silver coins', *NC*, 7th series, 6 (1966), 251–330, with a genealogical table and a list of rulers at pp. 255–6.

154

THE TOQAY TEMÜRIDS OR JĀNIDS OR ASHTARKHĀNIDS

1007–1160/1599–1747

Transoxania and northern Afghanistan

- 1007/1599 Jānī Muḥammad b. Yār Muḥammad
 - 1012/1603 Bāqī Muḥammad b. Jānī Muḥammad
 - 1014/1605 Walī Muḥammad b. Jānī Muḥammad
 - 1020/1611 Imām Qulī b. Dīn Muḥammad b. Jānī Muḥammad as
Great Khān in Transoxania, with Nadhr Muḥammad
b. Dīn Muḥammad as lesser Khān in Balkh
 - 1051/1641 Nadhr Muḥammad, as ruler of the reunited khanate,
then 1055–61/1645–51 in Balkh only
 - 1055/1645 ‘Abd al-‘Azīz b. Nadhr Muḥammad, Khān in Transoxania
only, after 1061/1651 Great Khān, with Šubḥān Qulī
b. Nadhr Muḥammad as lesser Khān in Balkh
 - 1092/1681 Šubḥān Qulī as ruler of the reunited khanate
 - 1114/1702 ‘Ubaydallāh b. Šubḥān Qulī
 - 1123–60/1711–47 Abu ‘l-Fayḍ b. Šubḥān Qulī
 - 1160/1747 *De facto transfer of power to the Mangīts*
 - (1160–c. 1163/
 - 1747–c. 1750 ‘Abd al-Mu‘min b. Abi ‘l-Fayḍ
 - 1164–5/1751–2 ‘Ubaydallāh b. Abi ‘l-Fayḍ
 - after 1172/1758 Abu ‘l-Ghāzī b. ‘Abd al-Mu‘min,
- | | |
|---|--|
| } | nominal
khāns
under the
Mangīts |
|---|--|
- deposed shortly after 1203/1789)

It was a Toqay Temürid force which killed the last Abu ‘l-Khayrid Pīr Muḥammad (see above, no. 153). This group, under the leadership of Jānī Muḥammad, descendant of a prince from the ruling house of Astrakhan (see above, no. 131) (whence the name of Ashtarkhānids given to the family which was now to rule in Transoxania and the lands along the upper Oxus), then assumed the khanate for itself, with the general acquiescence of the Özbeg amīrs of Transoxania and Balkh, who regarded its members as being suitable continuers of the Chingizid system. Members of the Jānī Begid family of the Abu ‘l-Khayrids were elbowed aside. As in previous régimes, appanages were distributed to princes of the new ruling family; but for two considerable stretches during the seventeenth century, there was something like a double khanate system, with one brother in Transoxania as Great Khān and another brother in Balkh as lesser Khān. The Khāns in Bukhara had to preserve their authority against internal elements such as the Qazaqs and external powers like the ‘Arabshāhids of Khwārazm (see above, no. 153), activist and aggressive in the mid-seventeenth century under Abu ‘l-Ghāzī and his son Anūsha Muḥammad, while those in Balkh were involved in relations with the Šafawids and the Mughals.

Latterly, the rise of powerful Özbeg chiefs and the ravages of the Qazaqs led to a serious decline in order and prosperity in Transoxania. After the death of the last powerful and significant Jānid ruler, Subḥān Qulī, real political power at

Bukhara fell more and more into the hands of the Khāns' *Ataliq* or Chief Minister Muḥammad Ḥakīm Biy Mangīt and his son, and it was from the Mangīts that the ultimate line of Khāns of Bukhara was to arise (see below, no. 155). But at least two puppet khāns from the Jānid family were retained by the Mangīts after Abu 'l-Fayd b. Subḥān Qulī's time (sc. after 1160/1747), and such *fainéants* seem to have continued on the throne at Bukhara until almost the end of the eighteenth century.

Lane-Poole, 274–5; Zambaur, 273; Album, 63.

*EL*² 'Djānids' (B. Spuler); *EI* 'Central Asia. VI. In the 10th–12th/16th–18th centuries' (Robert D. McChesney). 'VII. In the 12th–13th/18th–19th centuries' (Y. Bregel).

Hélène Carrère d'Encausse, *Islam and the Russian Empire. Reform and Revolution in Central Asia*, London 1988, with a list of the rulers in Bukhara at p. 193.

155

THE MANGITS 1166–1339/1753–1920 *The Khanate of Bukhara*

- 1160/1747 Muḥammad Raḥīm *Ataliq* b. Muḥammad Ḥakīm Biy, at first with puppet khāns, after 1166/1753 as sole ruler and Amīr, in 1170/1756 Khān
- o 1172/1758 Dāniyāl Biy *Ataliq* b. Muḥammad, uncle of Muḥammad Raḥīm, at first as regent for his nephew Faḍil Tora, then with puppet Jānid khāns
- o 1199/1785 Shāh Murād b. Dāniyāl Biy, Amīr-i Ma'sūm
- o 1215/1800 Sayyid Ḥaydar Tora b. Shāh Murād
- o 1242/1826 Sayyid Ḥusayn b. Ḥaydar Tora
- 1242/1827 'Umar b. Ḥaydar Tora
- o 1242/1827 Naṣr Allāh b. Ḥaydar Tora
- o 1277/1860 Muẓaffar al-Dīn b. Naṣr Allāh
- o 1303/1886 'Abd al-Aḥad b. Muẓaffar al-Dīn
- o 1328–39/1910–20 Sayyid 'Ālim Khān b. 'Abd al-Aḥad
- 1339/1920 *Overthrow of the Khanate*

The Mangits of Bukhara arose from an Özbek tribe of the same name which became influential under the Toqay Temürids or Jānids (see above, no. 154), so that in the early eighteenth century Khudāyār Biy Mangīt became *Ataliq* or Chief Minister to Abu 'l-Fayḍ Khān, being followed in this office by his son Muḥammad Ḥakīm and his grandson Muḥammad Raḥīm. Very soon the family became the real rulers in Bukhara, although they continued to enthrone puppet khāns from the Jānids until the end of the eighteenth century. Shāh Murād, however, ended this pretence and himself reigned as fully sovereign Amīr; this last title was borne by all the remaining members of his line, indicating that they saw themselves as Islamic monarchs *par excellence* and not as khāns in the Turkish steppe tradition.

The greatest single event in the history of Central Asia during the nineteenth century was, of course, the territorial and military advance of Imperial Russia. The Amīr Muẓaffar al-Dīn was crushingly defeated by the Russians, lost some of his territory and in effect lost his independence (1285/1868). The Khanate survived, within somewhat shrunken boundaries, with little Russian interference in its internal affairs, so that the Amīrs remained as despotic and capricious and the religious classes as fanatical and ignorant as before. But in September 1920 the Amīr's rule was overthrown and a 'People's Republic of Bukhara' set up, soon to be replaced by a forcibly imposed Bolshevism; the last ruler, 'Ālim Khān, fled to exile in Kabul.

Lane-Poole, 276–7; Zambaur, 273–4; Album, 63.

EI² 'Mangits' (Y. Bregel); *EIR* 'Central Asia. VII. In the 12th–13th/18th–19th centuries' (Yuri Bregel).

Hélène Carrère d'Encausse, *Islam and the Russian Empire*, with a list of rulers at p. 193. Edward A. Allworth, *Central Asia: 130 Years of Russian Dominance*, 3rd edn, Durham NC and London.

156

THE QUNGRATS OR İNAQIDS 1184–1338/1770–1920 *The Khanate of Khiva (Khīwa)*

- 1184/1770 Muḥammad Amīn as *İnaq* for puppet khāns of the Qazaq Chingizids
- 1204/1790 'Awaz b. Muḥammad Amīn, *İnaq*
- 1218/1803 Eltüzer b. 'Awaz, *İnaq* and then in 1219/1804 Khān
- o 1221/1806 Muḥammad Raḥīm b. 'Awaz
- o 1240/1825 Allāh Qulī b. Muḥammad Raḥīm
- 1258/1842 Raḥīm Qulī b. Allāh Qulī
- o 1261/1845 Muḥammad Amīn b. Allāh Qulī, Abu 'l-Ghāzi, called Medemīn
- 1271/1855 'Abdallāh b. 'Ubaydallāh, great-grandson of 'Awaz
- 1272/1856 Qutlugh Murād b. 'Ubaydallāh
- o 1272/1856 Sayyid Muḥammad Bahādur b. Muḥammad Raḥīm
- o 1281/1864 Sayyid Muḥammad Raḥīm b. Sayyid Muḥammad Bahādur
- 1328/1910 Isfandiyār b. Sayyid Muḥammad Raḥīm
- o 1336–8/1918–20 Sa'īd 'Abdallāh
- 1338/1920 *Overthrow of the Khanate*

By the mid-eighteenth century, power in the Khanate of Khiva, covering essentially the older province of Khwārazm, was disputed by two powerful families of the Qazaq Chingizids. In 1176/1763, the leader of the Qungrat tribe of the Özbegs, Muḥammad Amīn *İnaq* (the old title *inaq* 'trusted adviser [of the ruler]' was by now given to tribal chiefs), became chief of all the local Özbeg tribal chiefs. As Atalīq of Khiva, he subdued the Yomud Turkmens and became virtual ruler, installing puppet khāns from the Qazaq Chingizids. He and his son 'Awaz nevertheless did not themselves assume the title of Khān, but Eltüzer b. 'Awaz felt strong enough to dispense with Chingizid puppets and proclaim himself Khān, founding a new, and the ultimate, line of rulers in Khiva. As in the other two Central Asian khanates, the rulers were by now able to behave more despotically through a declining reliance on Özbeg and other tribal forces and the use of their own personal forces of guards. The Khāns of Khiva were for a while able to expand as far south as Merv (Marw); they continually raided Persian territory in northern Khurasan; and they expanded northwards into the Qazaq Steppe.

But the Khāns were totally unable to withstand Russian pressures. In 1290/1873, a Russian army occupied Khiva with minimal resistance, and stringent peace terms were imposed on what now became a vastly-reduced khanate. The Russians did not interfere internally at Khiva, but the Khāns had no independent status and were far more circumscribed than their fellow-Khāns of Bukhara. In April 1920 the last Khān Sa'īd 'Abdallāh was deposed and a 'People's Republic of Khiva' proclaimed, to be replaced a year later by a Bolshevik régime.

Lane-Poole, 278–9; Zambaur, 275–6; Album, 64.

*El*² 'K̲hiwa' (W. Barthold and M. M. Brill), Suppl. 'Inak' (Y. Bregel); *EIT* 'Central Asia. VII. In the 12th–13th/18th–19th centuries' (Yuri Bregel).

Edward A. Allworth, *Central Asia: 130 Years of Russian Dominance*, 3rd edn.

157

THE MINGS

1213–93/1798–1876

The Khanate of Khokand (Khoqand)

- 1213/1798 'Ālim b. Nārbūta Biy
- o 1225/1810 Muḥammad 'Umar b. Nārbūta Biy
- o 1238/1822 Muḥammad 'Alī b. Nārbūta Biy
- 1258/1842 Shīr 'Alī b. Ḥājji Biy
- o 1261/1845 Murād b. 'Ālim
- 1261/1845 Muḥammad Khudāyār b. Shīr 'Alī, first reign
- o 1274/1858 Mallā b. Shīr 'Alī
- o 1278/1862 Shāh Murād, nephew of Mallā
- 1278/1862 Muḥammad Khudāyār, second reign
- o 1280/1863 Sayyid Sulṭān or Sulṭān (Mīr) Sayyid b. Mallā
- o 1281/1865 Muḥammad Khudāyār, third reign
- 1292–3/1875–6 o Naṣr al-Dīn b. Khudāyār } rival claimants
- o Ishāq Mullā or Muḥammad Pūlād }
- 1293/1876 *Suppression of the Khanate by Russia*

During the later eighteenth century, a third Özbek khanate, in addition to those of Bukhara and Khiva (see above, nos 155–6), emerged under leaders of the Ming tribe in Farghāna. The rise of the ruling family is usually traced back to Shāh Rukh Ataliq (d. between 1121 and 1133/1709–21). His son 'Abd al-Karīm Biy in 1153/1740 founded the town of Khokand, which was to become the capital of his family's khanate. His grandson Nārbūta united Farghāna under Ming rule, so that his son and successor 'Ālim could assume the title of Khān and formally begin the dynasty. His brother and successor Muḥammad 'Umar went even further and claimed the title of Amīr al-Mu'minīn on his coins. The Mings soon came to control very extensive territories, beginning with the capture of Tashkent, of great strategic and commercial importance, in 1224/1809, and continuing with expansion northwards into the Qazaq Steppe and across the T'ien Shan into Eastern Turkestan, where the Khāns controlled customs duties from the so-called 'six towns' there, and into the Pamirs region. Khokand thus became greater in territory than its two fellow-khanates, if not in population.

Like the other khanates, Khokand was racked by internal tribal and other feuds, and was at one point briefly occupied by Bukhara. It was also threatened by Russian imperial expansion. In 1282/1865, Tashkent was captured and a commercial treaty imposed by Russia on Khokand. In 1292/1875, an internal rebellion brought the Russian army into the Khanate, and early in the next year it was suppressed and its territories annexed to the governorate-general of Turkestan as its Farghānan province.

Lane-Poole, 280; Zambaur, 276; Album, 64.

ET² 'Khokand' (W. Barthold and C. E. Bosworth); EIR 'Central Asia. VII. In the 12th–13th/18th–19th centuries' (Yuri Bregel).

Edward A. Allworth, *Central Asia: 120 Years of Russian Rule*, 3rd edn.

SIXTEEN

Afghanistan and the Indian Subcontinent

158

THE GHAZNAWIDS
366–582/977–1186

Afghanistan, Khurasan, Baluchistan and north-western India

- o 366/977 Sebūktigin b. Qara Bechkem, Abū Manšūr Našir al-Dīn
wa 'l-Dawla, governor in Ghazna for the Sāmānids
- o 387/997 Ismā'il b. Sebūktigin
- o 388/998 Maḥmūd b. Sebūktigin, Abū 'l-Qāsim Sayf al-Dawla,
Yamīn al-Dawla wa-Amīn al-Milla
- o 421/1030 Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd, Abū Aḥmad Jalāl al-Dawla,
first reign
- o 421/1031 Mas'ūd I b. Maḥmūd, Abū Sa'id Shihāb al-Dawla
- 432/1040 Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd, second reign
- o 432/1041 Mawdūd b. Mas'ūd, Abū 'l-Fath Shihāb al-Dawla
- ? 440/1048 Mas'ūd II b. Mawdūd, Abū Ja'far
- ? 440/1048 'Alī b. Mas'ūd, Abū 'l-Ḥasan Bahā' al-Dawla
- o ? 440/1049 'Abd al-Rashīd b. Maḥmūd, Abū Manšūr 'Izz al-Dawla
wa-Zayn al-Milla
- o 443/1052 *Usurpation in Ghazna of the slave commander Abū
Sa'id Toḡhrīl, Qiwām al-Dawla*
- o 443/1052 Farrukhzād b. Mas'ūd I, Abū Shujā' Jamāl al-Dawla wa-
Kamāl al-Milla
- o 451/1059 Ibrāhīm b. Mas'ūd, Abū 'l-Muẓaffar Zāhīr al-Dawla wa-
Našir al-Milla
- o 492/1099 Mas'ūd III b. Ibrāhīm, Abū Sa'd Abu 'l-Mulūk 'Alā' al-
Dawla wa 'l-Dīn
- 508/1115 Shīrẓād b. Mas'ūd III, 'Aḍud al-Dawla, Kamāl al-Dawla
- o 509/1116 Malik Arslan or Arslan Shāh b. Mas'ūd III, Sulṭān al-Dawla
- 510/1117 *Seljuq occupation of Ghazna*
- o 511/1117 Bahrām Shāh b. Mas'ūd III, Abū 'l-Muẓaffar Yamīn al-
Dawla wa-Amīn al-Milla, first reign
- 545/1150 *Ghūrīd occupation of Ghazna*
- 547/1152 or after Bahrām Shāh b. Mas'ūd III, second reign
- o ? 552/1157 Khusraw Shāh b. Bahrām Shāh, Mu'izz al-Dawla, latterly
in north-western India only
- o 555–82/1160–86 Khusraw Malik b. Khusraw Shāh, Abū 'l-Muẓaffar Tāj al-
Dawla, in north-western India, k. 587/1191
- 582/1186 *Ghūrīd conquest*

On the death in 350/961 of the Sāmānid Amīr ‘Abd al-Malik (see above, no. 83), the Turkish slave commander of the Sāmānid army in Khurasan, Alptigin, attempted to manipulate the succession at Bukhara in his own favour. He failed, and was obliged to withdraw with some of his troops to Ghazna in what is now eastern Afghanistan. Here on the periphery of the Sāmānid empire, and facing the pagan subcontinent of India, a series of Turkish commanders followed Alptigin, governing nominally for the Sāmānids, until in 366/977 Sebūktigin came to power. Under him, the Ghaznawid tradition of raiding the plains of India in search of treasure and slaves was established, but it was his son Maḥmūd who became fully independent and who achieved a reputation throughout the eastern Islamic world as hammer of the infidels, penetrating down the Ganges valley to Muttra (Mat’hurā) and Kanawj and into the Kathiawar (Kāfiāwār) peninsula to attack the famous idol temple there of Somnath (Sūmanāt). In the north, he set up the Oxus as his frontier with the rival power of the Qarakhānids (see above, no. 90), and annexed Khwārazm. The former Sāmānid province of Khurasan was taken over and, towards the end of his life, Maḥmūd’s armies marched into northern and western Persia and overthrew the Būyid amirate there (see above, no. 75, 1).

Maḥmūd’s empire at his death was thus the most extensive and imposing edifice in eastern Islam since the time of the Saffārids (see above, no. 84), and his army the most effective military machine of the age. With the adoption of Persian administrative and cultural ways, the Ghaznawids threw off their original Turkish steppe background and became largely integrated with the Perso-Islamic tradition. But under his son Mas’ūd I, Maḥmūd’s empire – essentially a personal creation – could not be maintained in the west against the Seljuqs (see above, no. 91), and Khwārazm, Khurasan and northern Persia were lost to the incomers. The middle years of the eleventh century were largely spent in warfare with the Seljuqs over possession of Sistan and western Afghanistan. At the accession of Ibrāhīm b. Mas’ūd in 451/1059, a *modus vivendi* was worked out with the Seljuqs, and peace reigned substantially for over half a century.

Reduced as it now was to eastern Afghanistan, Baluchistan and north-western India, the Ghaznawid empire was still an imposing and powerful one. It inevitably acquired a more pronounced orientation towards India, but the courts of the sultans of the twelfth century were centres of a splendid Persian culture, with such luminaries as the mystical poet Sanā’i. In the early part of that century, the Ghaznawid Bahrām Shāh became tributary to the Seljuqs, for Sanjar had helped Bahrām Shāh secure his throne. Towards the end of the latter’s reign, the capital Ghazna suffered a frightful sacking by the ‘World Incendiary’, the Ghūrid ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Husayn (see below, no. 159). The rise of the Ghūrids in fact reduced the power of the last Ghaznawids, and their rule was latterly confined to the Punjab (Panjāb) until the Ghūrid Mu’izz al-Dīn Muḥammad finally extinguished the line in 582/1186.

Justi, 444; Lane-Poole, 285–90; Zambaur, 282–3; Album, 36–7.

ET² ‘Ghaznawids’ (B. Spuler); EIT ‘Ghaznavids’ (C. E. Bosworth).

C. E. Bosworth, ‘The titlature of the early Ghaznavids’, *Oriens*, 15 (1962), 210–33.

idem, *The Ghaznavids. Their Empire in Afghanistan and Eastern Iran 994:1040*, Edinburgh 1963.

idem, ‘The early Ghaznavids’, in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, IV, 162–97.

idem, *The Later Ghaznavids: Splendour and Decay. The Dynasty in Afghanistan and Northern India 1040–1186*, Edinburgh 1977.

159

THE GHÜRIDS

Early fifth century to 612/early eleventh century to 1215
Ghūr, Khurasan and north-western India

1. The main line in Ghūr and then also in Ghazna

- ? Muḥammad b. Sūrī Shansabānī, chief in Ghūr
- 401/1011 until
- the 420s/1030s Abū 'Alī b. Muḥammad, Ghaznavid vassal
- ? 'Abbās b. Shīth
- after 451/1059 Muḥammad b. 'Abbās
- ? Ḥasan b Muḥammad, Qutb al-Dīn
- 493/1100 Ḥusayn I b. Ḥasan, Abu 'l-Mulūk 'Izz al-Dīn
- 540/1146 Sūrī b. Ḥusayn I, Sayf al-Dīn, in Firūzkūh as Malik al-Jibāl
- 544/1149 Sām I b. Ḥusayn I, Bahā' al-Dīn
- o 544/1149 Ḥusayn II b. Ḥusayn I, 'Alā' al-Dīn Jahān-sūz
- o 556/1161 Muḥammad b. Ḥusayn II, Sayf al-Dīn
- o 558/1163 Muḥammad b. Sām I Bahā' al-Dīn, Abu 'l-Fath Shams al-Dīn, Ghiyāth al-Dīn, supreme sultan in Firūzkūh
- o (569–99/1173–1203 Muḥammad b. Sām I, Shihāb al-Dīn, Mu'izz al-Dīn, ruler in Ghazna)
- o 599/1203 Muḥammad b. Sām I, supreme sultan in Ghūr and India
- o 602/1206 Maḥmūd b. Muḥammad Ghiyāth al-Dīn, Ghiyāth al-Dīn
- o (602–11/1206–15 Yildīz Mu'izzī, Tāj al-Dīn, governor in Ghazna for Maḥmūd Ghiyāth al-Dīn)
- 609/1212 Sām II b. Maḥmūd, Bahā' al-Dīn
- 610/1213 Atsīz b. Ḥusayn II, 'Alā' al-Dīn, vassal of the Khwārazm Shāh
- 611–12/1214–15 Muḥammad b. 'Alī Shujā' al-Dīn b. 'Alī 'Alā' al-Dīn b. Ḥusayn I, Diyā' al-Dīn, 'Alā' al-Dīn, vassal of the Khwārazm Shāh
- 612/1215 *Khwārazmian conquest*

2. The line in Bāmiyān, Tukhāristān and Badakhshān

- o 540/1145 Mas'ūd b. Ḥusayn I 'Izz al-Dīn, Fakhr al-Dīn
- o 558/1163 Muḥammad b. Mas'ūd Fakhr al-Dīn, Shams al-Dīn
- o 588/1192 Sām b. Muḥammad Shams al-Dīn, Bahā' al-Dīn
- o 602–12/1206–15 'Alī b. Sām Bahā' al-Dīn, Jalāl al-Dīn
- 612/1215 *Khwārazmian conquest*

The remote, mountainous region of what is now Afghanistan, called Ghūr, was almost wholly *terra incognita* to the early Islamic geographers, known only as a source of slaves and as the home of a race of bellicose mountaineers who remained pagan until well into the eleventh century. At this time, the Ghaznavids (see above, no. 158) led raids into Ghūr and made the local chiefs of the

Shansabānī family their vassals; but in the early twelfth century, the fortunes of the Ghaznawids waned and Seljuq influence now spread through Ghūr, so that 'Izz al-Dīn Ḥusayn, the first fully historical figure of the family, paid tribute to Sultan Sanjar (see above, no. 91, 1). Attempts by Sultan Bahrām Shāh to reassert Ghaznawid influence led to the Ghūrids' sack of Ghazna in 545/1150 and the eventual acquisition by them of all the Ghaznawid possessions on the Afghan plateau. In the west, Ghūrid expansionist policies were at first checked by Sanjar, but the collapse of Seljuq power in Khurasan allowed the Sultans to establish an empire, centred on Firūzkūh in Ghūr, stretching almost from the Caspian Sea to northern India, where the Ghaznawid traditions of *jihād* against the infidels were inherited and kept up.

The joint architects of this achievement were the two brothers Ghiyāth al-Dīn Muḥammad and Mu'izz al-Dīn Muḥammad, the former campaigning mainly in the west and the latter in India. Bāmiyān and the lands along the upper Oxus were ruled by another branch of the Ghūrid family. Ghiyāth al-Dīn contested possession of Khurasan with the Khwārazm Shāhs and the latter's suzerains, the Qara Khitay (see above, no. 89, 4); at one point he invaded Khwārazm itself, and by his death held all Khurasan as far west as Bistām.

Yet it seems that the Ghūrids' resources of manpower were inadequate for holding this empire together, whereas their Khwārazmian adversaries could draw freely on the Inner Asian steppes for troops. After Mu'izz al-Dīn Muḥammad's death in 602/1206, the dynasty was rent by internal squabbles. A group of their Turkish soldiers made themselves independent in Ghazna under Tāj al-Dīn Yildiz, and could not be dislodged by the sultans in Firūzkūh and Bāmiyān. The Khwārazm Shāh Jalāl al-Dīn was therefore able to step in and incorporate the Ghūrid lands into his own empire. But this Khwārazmian domination was only of brief duration, for the whole eastern Islamic world was shortly afterwards overwhelmed by Chingiz Khān's Mongols (see above, no. 131). Moreover, the Turkish generals of Mu'izz al-Dīn Muḥammad continued to uphold Ghūrid policies and traditions in northern India, where Quṭb al-Dīn Aybak was installed as ruler in Lahore (Lāhawur) by one of the last Ghūrids (see below, no. 160, 1).

The coinage of the Ghūrids is particularly interesting, in that Mu'izz al-Dīn Muḥammad minted coins for his Indian lands with the Islamic *shahāda* and its proclamation of *tawḥīd*, the indivisible unity of God, on one side, and on the other side Sanskrit inscriptions and the likeness of the Hindu goddess Lakṣmi.

Justi, 455–6; Lane-Poole, 291–4; Zambaur, 280–1, 284; Album, 39–40.

ET² 'Ghūrids' (C. E. Bosworth); EIT 'Ghurids' (C. E. Bosworth).

G. Wiet, in André Maricq and Gaston Wiet, *Le minaret de Djām. La découverte de la capitale des sultans ghorides (XII^e–XIII^e siècles)*, Méms DAFA, 16, Paris 1959, 31–54.

C. E. Bosworth, 'The eastern fringes of the Iranian world: the end of the Ghaznavids and the upsurge of the Ghūrids', in *The Cambridge History of Iran*, IV, 157–66.

1. The Mu'izzī or Shamsī Slave Kings

- 602/1206 Aybak, Quṭb al-Dīn, Malik of Hindūstān in Lahore for the Ghūrīds
- 607/1210 Ārām Shāh, protégé, dubious son, of Aybak, in Lahore
- 607/1211 Iltutmish b. Ilam Khān, Shams al-Dīn, sultan in Delhi (Dihlī)
- 633/1236 Fīrūz Shāh I b. Iltutmish, Rukn al-Dīn
- 634/1236 Rāḍiyya Begum b. Iltutmish, Jalālat al-Dīn
- 637/1240 Bahrām Shāh b. Iltutmish, Mu'izz al-Dīn
- 639/1242 Mas'ūd Shāh b. Fīrūz Shāh I, 'Alā' al-Dīn
- 644/1246 Maḥmūd Shāh I b. Nāṣir al-Dīn b. Iltutmish, Nāṣir al-Dīn
- 664/1266 Balban, Ulugh Khān, Ghiyāth al-Dīn, already viceroy (*nā'ib-i mamlakat*) in the previous reign
- 686/1287 Kay Qubādh b. Bughra Khān b. Balban, Mu'izz al-Dīn
- 689/1290 Kayūmarth b. Mu'izz al-Dīn Kay Qubādh, Shams al-Dīn

2. The Khaljīs

- 689/1290 Fīrūz Shāh II Khaljī b. Yughrush, Jalāl al-Dīn
- 695/1296 Ibrāhīm Shāh I Qadīr Khān b. Fīrūz Shāh II, Rukn al-Dīn
- 695/1296 Muḥammad Shāh I 'Alī Garshāsp b. Mas'ūd b. Yughrush, 'Alā' al-Dīn
- 715/1316 'Umar Shāh b. Muḥammad Shāh I, Shihāb al-Dīn
- 716–20/1316–20 Mubārak Shāh b. Muḥammad Shāh I, Quṭb al-Dīn
- 720/1320 *Usurpation of Khusraw Khān Barwārī, Nāṣir al-Dīn*

3. The Tughluqids

- 720/1320 Tughluq Shāh I b. ? Ghāzī, Ghiyāth al-Dīn
- 725/1325 Muḥammad Shāh II b. Tughluq Shāh I, Abu 'l-Mujāhid Ulugh Khān Jawna Ghiyāth al-Dīn
- 752/1351 Fīrūz Shāh III b. Rajab b. Tughluq Shāh I, Kamāl al-Dīn
- (752/1351 Maḥmūd, Ghiyāth al-Dīn, alleged son of Muḥammad Shāh II, puppet of the rebel Khwāja-yi Jahān Aḥmad Ayāz)
- (789/1387 Muḥammad Shāh III b. Fīrūz Shāh III, Nāṣir al-Dīn, as co-ruler with his father)
- 790/1388 Tughluq Shāh II b. Faṭḥ Khan b. Fīrūz Shāh III, Ghiyāth al-Dīn, k. 791/1389
- (? 791/1389 ? Fīrūz Shāh Zafar b. Fīrūz Shāh III; identical with the next ruler?)

- o 791-3/1389-91 Abū Bakr Shāh b. Zafar b. Fīrūz Shāh III, in Delhi
- o 791-6/1389-94 Muḥammad Shāh III b. Fīrūz Shāh III, Nāṣir al-Dīn, in the provinces and then Delhi
- o 796/1394 Sikandar Shāh I b. Muḥammad III, 'Alā' al-Dīn
- o 796/1394 Maḥmūd Shāh II b. Muḥammad III, Nāṣir al-Dīn, first reign
- o (797/1395 Nuṣrat Shāh b. Faṭḥ Khān, in Fīrūzābād, d. 801/1399)
- 804/1401 Maḥmūd Shāh II b. Muḥammad III, second reign
- 815-17/1412-14 *Succession of Dawlat Khān Lōdī*

4. The Sayyids

- 817/1414 Khidr Khān b. Sulaymān, *Rāyat-i A'lā*
- o 824/1421 Mubārak Shāh II b. Khidr, Mu'izz al-Dīn
- o 837/1434 Muḥammad Shāh IV b. Farīd b. Khidr
- o 847-55/1443-51 'Ālam Shāh b. Muḥammad IV, 'Alā' al-Dīn, 855-83/1451-78 ruler in Badaon (Badā'un)

5. The Lōdīs

- o 855/1451 Bahlūl b. Kālā b. Bahrām Lōdī
- o 894/1489 Sikandar II Nizām Khān b. Bahlūl
- o 923-32/1517-26 Ibrāhīm II b. Sikandar II
- 932/1526 *Mughal victory*

6. The Sūrīs

- o 947/1540 Shīr Shāh Sūr b. Miyān Ḥasan, Farīd al-Dīn
- o 952/1545 Islām Shāh Sūr b. Shīr Shāh
- o 961/1554 Muḥammad V Mubārīz Khān 'Ādil Shāh b. Nizām Khān b. Ismā'il
- o 961/1554 Ibrāhīm Khān III b. Ghāzī b. Ismā'il
- o 962/1555 Aḥmad Khān Sikandar Shāh III b. Ismā'il, in Lahore
- 962/1555 *Mughal conquest*

Islam was first implanted in the lower Indus valley by the Arab governors of the East for the Umayyad caliphs; in 92/711, Sind was conquered by the commander Muḥammad b. al-Qāsim al-Thaqafī. This foothold was retained during the next three centuries, a period in which some of the Muslim communities there were affected by the propaganda of Ismā'ilī Shī'ī missionaries, who were working intensively on behalf of the Fāṭimids (see above, no. 27) in many parts of the Islamic world, from North Africa to Yemen and the fringes of India. There were also trade contacts between Arabia and the Persian Gulf region and the coastlands of peninsular India, namely Gujarāt, Bombay and the Deccan coasts, just as there had been in classical times; but these sporadic and superficial contacts hardly affected the interior, the overwhelming land mass of the subcontinent.

It was the Turkish Ghaznawids who first brought the full weight of Muslim military power into northern India, overthrowing powerful native dynasties like the Hindūshāhīs of Wayhind, reducing many of the Rājput rulers to tributary

status and raiding as far as Somnath and Benares (Banāras, Varanasi), although most of those rulers who submitted threw off their obligations as soon as the Ghaznawid armies went back. Maḥmūd of Ghazna became an Islamic hero for his attacks on infidel Hindustan, but it is clear that the sultan was not a fanatical zealot, bent on the conversion or extermination of the Hindus – a palpably impossible task – since he used Indian troops in his own armies, and it does not seem that conversion to Islam was a condition of recruitment. The Ghaznawids' interest in India was primarily financial, the subcontinent being regarded as an almost inexhaustible reservoir of slaves and treasure; but they did take over the Punjab and make it a permanent base for the extension of Muslim power through northern India, and towards the end of the dynasty's life Lahore became the sultans' capital (see above, no. 158).

Hence there existed there a springboard for the Indian conquests of Mu'izz al-Dīn Muḥammad Ghūrī and his Turkish slave generals in the last years of the twelfth century and at the beginning of the thirteenth. After eliminating the last Ghaznawids, he expanded into the Gangetic plain, attacking local Rājput princes, such as the Chāhamāna or Chawhān king of Ajmer and Delhi (Dihli) and then the Gāhadavāla king of Benares and Kanawj. Among Mu'izz al-Dīn's commanders, Qutb al-Dīn Aybak was placed in charge of the Indian conquests during his master's lifetime, when the sultan was involved in Khurasan and elsewhere. Aybak held on to the Ghūrid conquests in the Punjab and the Ganges-Jumna Do'āb, and raided as far as Gujarāt. Another general, Ikhtiyār al-Dīn Muḥammad Khaljī, penetrated into Bihār and Bengal (Bangāla), making Gawr or Lakhnawatī his base there, and he even attacked Assam (see below, no. 161, 1). It is thus in the period of the Ghūrids and their commanders that the permanent establishment of Islam in northern India begins: long-established Hindu dynasties were humbled and the foundations of various Muslim sultanates laid. On the other hand, throughout the period of the Delhi Sultanate and after, many local Hindu chiefs retained their power, especially away from the main centres of Turco-Afghan military concentration, and Hindus always played important roles in the administrations and armies of Muslim potentates.

When Mu'izz al-Dīn died in 602/1206, Aybak assumed power in Lahore as *Malik* or ruler on behalf of the Ghūrid sultan in Firūzkūh. Henceforth, Ghazna and the Afghan provinces of the Ghūrid empire were severed from India, falling briefly to the Khwārazm Shāhs and then to the Mongols, but Ghūrid traditions of both civil authority and military organisation lived on in northern India under the succeeding Muslim rulers there. Aybak and his successors up to 689/1290 are often called the Slave Kings, although only three of them, Aybak, Iltutmish and Balban, were of servile origin and all had in any case been manumitted by their masters before achieving power. Nor did these rulers belong to a single line, but to three distinct ones. Under Iltutmish, the real architect of an independent sultanate in Delhi, Sind, formerly in the hands of the Mu'izzī general Nāṣir al-Dīn Qabācha, was added to the Delhi Sultanate. He also managed to keep the Khwārazmians out of his dominions, but the Mongols overran the Punjab in 639/1241, sacking Lahore and advancing as far as Uch (Uchchh). A succession of weaker sultans brought internal discord, and the unity of the Sultanate was only assured first by the regency and then by the independent rule of the capable Balban, who had been originally one of the famous band of Turkish military slaves, the *Chihilgān*

(in the surmise of Dr Peter Jackson, so called because they each themselves commanded forty military slaves) of Iltutmish. Balban continued the work of his master, placing the Sultanate on a firm military and governmental basis by his reforms, and exalting the authority of the sovereign on traditional Perso-Islamic lines. Spiritual links with the rest of the Islamic world were strengthened. Already, Iltutmish had sought investiture from the 'Abbāsid caliph al-Mustansir, after the demise of the last caliph in Baghdad, al-Musta'şim, the Mu'izzī sultans long continued to keep his name on their coins. In this way, one can discern the motif of identification with the wider world of Sunnī Islam and acknowledgement of the moral leadership of the caliphate; such threads run through much of the history of Indian Islam and reflect its struggle to maintain its identity against the pressures of the enveloping Hindu environment. Important, too, as a fertilising influence in the culture of this period were the waves of refugees – scholars and religious figures – from Transoxania and Persia, who fled before the Mongols and found their way to India during such reigns as those of Iltutmish and Balban; and in later times also, such as the reign of Muḥammad II b. Tughluq, infusions of fresh blood continued to revitalise Indo-Muslim religious life and culture.

In 689/1290, the Mu'izzī sultans were succeeded by the line of Jalāl al-Dīn Firūz Shāh II Khaljī. The Khalaj were originally a Turkish people (or perhaps a Turkicised people of a different ethnic origin) inhabiting eastern Afghanistan; it seems likely that the later Ghilzay Afghans were descended from them. During the reign of Mu'izz al-Dīn Muḥammad Ghūrī, the Khalaj had played a prominent part in the invasions of India, with Ikhtiyār al-Dīn Muḥammad Khaljī especially notable for bringing Islam to eastern India and Bengal (see above). The pressing task for Firūz Shāh II was to keep out the Mongols; it was, nevertheless, during his reign that large numbers of Mongols converted to Islam were allowed to settle in the Delhi area. The outstanding figure of the dynasty is undeniably 'Alā' al-Dīn Muḥammad Shāh I, who considered himself a second Alexander the Great and had grandiose dreams of assembling a vast empire. In actuality, he had to cope with the threat from the Chaghatayid Mongols, who several times raided as far as Delhi, but his ambitions found their main outlet in South India, the rich area south of the Vindhya Mountains as yet untouched by Muslim arms. An attack in 695/1296 on Deogīr or Devagiri in the north-western Deccan, capital of the Yādavas, brought him the wealth which he afterwards used to win the sultanate for himself, and when he was firmly established on the throne he sent further armies to the southernmost tip of the Deccan. 'Alā' al-Dīn Muḥammad continued to use the traditional designation of *Nāsir Amīr al-Mu'minīn* 'Helper of the Commander of the Faithful'; the first and last Indo-Muslim ruler to appropriate for himself the caliphal title of *Amīr al-Mu'minīn* was his son Quṭb al-Dīn Mubārak Shāh I.

The Khaljī line collapsed when Khusraw Khān, a Gujarātī convert from Hinduism and favourite of the last Khaljī sultan, possibly apostasised from Islam and certainly briefly usurped the throne in Delhi. Muslim control was re-established by the Turco-Indian Tughluq Shāh I and his son Muḥammad Shāh II, who in 720/1320 inaugurated the reign of the Tughluqid sultans. The first did much to restore the stability of the Sultanate and to reimpose Muslim control over the Deccan. Muḥammad Shāh II is an enigmatic figure: a skilful general whose behaviour was nevertheless often erratic and his judgement poor. In-

creases of taxation necessary to run the sultanate and to finance warfare made him unpopular, but his decision of 727/1327 to transfer the capital from Delhi southwards to Deogīr, now renamed Dawlatābād, proved disastrous. On the other hand, he did successfully repel a Chaghatayid invasion from Transoxania, but his project for taking advantage of Chaghatayid weakness, perhaps in concert with the Il Khānids, and for invading Central Asia via the Pamirs (if such really was his intention, the sources being vague over this), was a chimera. Muḥammad Shāh II had diplomatic relations with the Islamic world outside India, including with the Mamlūks of Egypt (see above, no. 31), and sought investiture from the 'Abbāsīd puppet caliph in Cairo (see above, no. 3, 3). The diversion of energies to unrealistic military projects on the northern frontiers of the subcontinent led to a weakening of the Tughluqid hold over the Deccan. An independent Muslim sultanate arose in Ma'bar or Madura in the extreme south (see below, no. 166), and in 748/1347 the Bahmanid kingdom of the central Deccan was founded by 'Alā' al-Dīn Ḥasan Bahman Shāh (see below, no. 167, 1). Later, Firūz Shāh III restored sultanal authority in Sind and Bengal, but made no attempt to touch the Deccan. The last Tughluqids were weaklings, so that Tīmūr was able to invade India in 801/1398–9 and wreak great devastation; as a result, the political unity of the Sultanate was dissolved, and various Muslim leaders seized independent power in the provinces.

For rather less than forty years, power was in the hands of the line of Khidr Khān, former governor of Multan (Multān), first for the last Tughluqids and then for Tīmūr. Khidr Khān ruled in the names of Tīmūr and his son Shāh Rukh, contenting himself with the title *Rāyat-i A'lā* 'Exalted Banner'; because of their claim to a fictitious descent from the Prophet, his line acquired the name of Sayyids. The effective authority of the Sayyids was reduced to a small area round Delhi, and with their initial dependence on the Tīmūrīds they were unpopular with the Turkish and Afghan military classes in the capital. In 855/1451, their line was replaced by that of Bahlūl Khān, a chief of the Afghan tribe of the Lōdīs and formerly governor of Sirhind and Lahore. Bahlūl was the equal in vigour of the great Tughluqī sultans, and did much to restore Muslim prestige in India; the authority of Delhi was imposed over much of Central India, and the Sharqī rulers of Jawnpur (see below, no. 164) overthrown in 881/1477. His son Sikandar II conducted operations against the Rājput princes with some success, and moved his capital to Agra as being a better base for these attacks. However, the last Lōdī, Ibrāhīm II, alienated many of his nobles and commanders, and certain of these invited the Chaghatayid Mughal Bābur, then in Kabul, to intervene.

Bābur's victory at the first battle of Pānīpat, to the north of Delhi, in 932/1526 resulted in Ibrāhīm's death, the end of the Lōdī line and the first appearance of the dynasty of the Mughals in India. But this did not mean the permanent establishment yet of Bābur's line, for his son Humāyūn's reign was interrupted by the fifteen-year restoration of Afghan rule in India by Shīr Shāh Sūr. Operating from Bihār, Shīr Shāh defeated Humāyūn at Kanawj, thus negating all Bābur's work. As well as being a fine general, Shīr Shāh introduced important fiscal and land reforms. But for his premature death, a strong Afghan sultanate might have been implanted in India; discouraging Humāyūn from trying his fortunes once more; as it was, the weakness of Shīr Shāh's ephemeral successors facilitated a successful Mughal revanche.

- Justi, 464–5; Lane-Poole, 295–303; Sachau, 32 no. 87 (Khaljīs), 33 no. 93 (Sūris); Zambaur, 285–8.
- ^{Et}2 'Dihli Sultanate' (P. Hardy), 'Hind. IV. History' (J. Burton-Page); 'Khaljīs' (S. Moinul Haq), 'Lōdis' (S. M. Imamuddin), 'Sayyids' (K. A. Nizami), 'Sūris' (I. H. Siddiqi).
- H. Nelson Wright, *The Coinage and Metrology of the Sultāns of Dehli, Incorporating a Catalogue of the Coins in the Author's Cabinet now in the Dehli Museum*, Delhi 1936.
- K. S. Lal, *History of the Khaljis A.D. 1290–1320*, revised edn, New Delhi 1980.
- (Agha) Mahdi Husain, *Tughluq Dynasty*, Calcutta 1963.
- Abd ul-Halim, *History of the Lodi Sultans of Delhi and Agra*, Dacca 1961.
- I. H. Siddiqi, *History of Sher Shah Sur*, Aligarh 1971.
- R. C. Majumdar, A. D. Pusalker and A. K. Majumdar (eds), *The History and Culture of the Indian People*. V. *The Struggle for Empire*, Bombay 1957, chs 4–5.
- eidem (eds), VI. *The Delhi Sultanate*, Bombay 1960, chs 2–9, 14.
- Majumdar (ed.), VII. *The Mughul Empire*, Bombay 1974, ch. 4.
- Mohammad Habib and Khaliq Ahmad Nizami (eds), *A Comprehensive History of India*. V. *The Delhi Sultanat (A.D. 1206–1526)*, Delhi 1970, chs 2–7.

1. The governors for the Delhi Sultans, often ruling as independent sovereigns

- ◊ 594/1198 Muḥammad Bakhtiyār Khalījī, Ikhtiyār al-Dīn, conqueror of Bihār and Bengal
- 603/1206 'Alī Mardān, first term of office
- 603/1207 Muḥammad Shirān Khān, 'Izz al-Dīn
- ◊ 604/1208 'Iwāḍ, Ḥusām al-Dīn, first term of office
- 607/1210 'Alī Mardān, ruling title 'Alā' al-Dīn, second term of office
- ◊ 610/1213 'Iwāḍ, Ḥusām al-Dīn, ruling title Ghiyāth al-Dīn
- ◊ 624/1227 Maḥmūd b. Iltutmish, Nāṣir al-Dīn, Malik al-Sharq
- 626/1229 Bilge Khan b. Mawdūd, Ikhtiyār al-Dīn, ruled as Dawlat Shāh
- 629/1232 Mas'ūd Jānī, 'Alā' al-Dīn, first term of office
- ◊ 630/1233 Aybak Khitā'ī, Sayf al-Dīn
- 633/1236 Ā'or Khan Aybak
- 633/1236 Toghrlī Toghān Khān, 'Izz al-Dīn
- 642/1244 Temūr Qirān Khān, Qamar al-Dīn
- 645/1247 Mas'ūd Jānī b. Mas'ūd Jānī, Jalāl al-Dīn, first term of office
- ◊ 649/1251 Yuzbak, Ikhtiyār al-Dīn, with the ruling title Abu 'l-Muẓaffar Ghiyāth al-Dīn
- 655/1257 Balban Yuzbakī, 'Izz al-Dīn, first term of office
- 657/1259 Mas'ūd Jānī b. Mas'ūd Jānī, second term of office
- 657/1259 Balban Yuzbakī, second term of office
- 657/1259 Muḥammad Arslan Khān Sanjar, Tāj al-Dīn
- 663/1265 Tātār Khān b. Muḥammad Arslan
- 666/1268 Shīr Khān
- 670–80/1272–81 Toghrlī, with the ruling title Mughīth al-Dīn

2. The governors, and then independent rulers, of Balban's line

- 681/1282 Bughra b. Balban, Nāṣir al-Dīn
- ◊ 690/1291 Kay Kāwūs b. Bughra, Rukn al-Dīn
- ◊ 701–22/1302–22 Firūz Shāh, Shams al-Dīn, latterly in Bihār only
- ◊ c. 709/c. 1309 Maḥmūd b. Firūz Shāh, Jalāl al-Dīn, in Bengal
- ◊ c. 717–18/c. 1317–18 Bughra b. Firūz Shāh, Shihāb al-Dīn, in Bengal
- ◊ 722/1322 Bahādur b. Firūz Shāh, Ghiyāth al-Dīn, also a provincial ruler during his father's lifetime, first term of office
- ◊ 724/1324 Ibrāhīm b. Firūz Shāh, Nāṣir al-Dīn, governor for the Delhi Sultan in Lakhnawati, d. after 728/1328
- ◊ 726–39/1326–38 Pindar or Bīdar Qadīr Khān, in Lakhnawati

- 726-41/1326-40 Yahyā, 'Izz al-Dīn, in Sātḡā'on
 727-39/1327-39 Bahrām, Tātār Khān, in Sonārgā'on
 o 727-8/1327-8 Bahādur b. Fīrūz Shāh, Ghiyāth al-Dīn, in Sonārgā'on
 jointly with Tātār Khān
 o 739-50/1339-49 Mubārak Shāh, Fakhr al-Dīn, in Sonārgā'on
 o 740-3/1339-42 'Alī Mubārak, 'Alā' al-Dīn, in Lakhnawati
 o 750-3/1349-52 Ghāzī Shāh (?) b. Mubārak Shāh, Ikhtiyār al-Dīn, in
 Sonārgā'on until its conquest by Ilyās Shāh

3. The line of Ilyās Shāh

- o 740/1339 Ilyās Shāh, Shams al-Dīn, originally in Sātḡā'on
 o 759/1358 Sikandar Shāh I b. Ilyās Shāh
 o 792/1390 A'zam Shāh b. Sikandar Shāh I, Ghiyāth al-Dīn
 o 813/1410 Ḥamza Shāh b. A'zam Shāh, Sayf al-Dīn
 o 815/1412 Bāyazīd Shāh b. A'zam Shāh, Sayf al-Dīn
 o 817/1414 Fīrūz Shāh b. Bāyazīd Shāh

4. The line of Rājā Gaṇeśa (Ganesh)

- 817/1414 Jadu, son of Rājā Gaṇeśa, first reign under the regency of
 his father
 o 819/1416 Rājā Gaṇeśa, as Danūj Mardan Deva
 o 821/1418 Mahendra Deva, son of Rājā Gaṇeśa
 o 821/1418 Jadu, now Muḥammad Shāh, Jalāl al-Dīn, second reign
 o 836-40/1433-7 Aḥmad Shāh b. Muḥammad Shāh

5. The line of Ilyās Shāh restored

- o 841/1437 Maḥmūd Shāh, descendant of Ilyās Shāh, Abu 'l-Muẓaffar
 Nāsir al-Dīn
 o 864/1460 Barbak Shāh b. Maḥmūd Shāh, Rukn al-Dīn
 o 879/1474 Yūsuf Shāh b. Barbak Shāh, Shams al-Dīn
 o 886/1481 Sikandar Shāh II (b) b. Yūsuf Shāh
 o 886-92/1481-7 Ḥusayn Faṭḥ Shāh b. Maḥmūd Shāh, Jalāl al-Dīn

6. The domination of the Ḥabashis

- o 892/1487 Sultān Shāhzāda Barbak Shāh
 o 892/1487 'Andil, ruled as Aḥmad Fīrūz Shāh Sayf al-Dīn
 o 895/1490 Maḥmūd Shāh (?) b. Aḥmad Fīrūz Shāh, Nāsir al-Dīn
 o 896-8/1491-3 Dīwāna, ruled as Muẓaffar Shams al-Dīn

7. The line of Sayyid Ḥusayn Shāh

- o 898/1493 Sayyid Ḥusayn Shāh, 'Alā' al-Dīn
 o 925/1519 Nuṣrat Shāh b. Ḥusayn Shāh, Nāsir al-Dīn
 o 939/1533 Fīrūz Shāh b. Ḥusayn Shāh, 'Alā' al-Dīn
 o 940-4/1534-7 Maḥmūd Shāh b. Ḥusayn Shāh, Ghiyāth al-Dīn

8. The Sūris

- 944/1537 Shīr Shāh Sūr
(947/1540 Khidr Khān, governor for Shīr Shāh)
○ 952/1545 Muḥammad Khān Sūr, Shams al-Dīn, independent in 960/
1553
○ 962/1555 Khidr Khān Bahādur Shāh b. Muḥammad Khān Sūr, Ghiyāth
al-Dīn
○ 968–71/1561–4 Jalāl Shāh b. Muḥammad Khān Sūr, Abu'l-Muzaffar Ghiyāth
al-Dīn

9. The Kararānīs

- 971/1564 Sulaymān Kararānī
980/1572 Bāyazīd Kararānī b. Sulaymān
○ 980–4/1572–6 Dāwūd Kararānī b. Sulaymān
984/1576 *Mughal conquest*

The conquest of the easternmost provinces of India, Bihār and Bengal, was the achievement of Mu'izz al-Dīn Muḥammad Ghūrī's commander Muḥammad Bakhtiyār Khaljī, who raided as far as the mountain barrier beyond which lay Tibet, and founded a capital at Lakhnawatī or Gawr in the frontier zone between Bihār and Bengal. Subsequently, governors of the Delhi Sultans made other towns into centres of government, Sātga'on in south-western Bengal and Sonārgā'on in the east (near modern Dacca or Dhākā), until Ilyās Shāh integrated all these into the independent Bengal sultanate. Because of the province's richness and its distance from Delhi, Bengal had always been difficult for the Sultans to administer, and central government control was often sporadic. In the first half of the fourteenth century, Muslim troops penetrated across the Brahmaputra into Sylhet (Silhet) and Assam and to Chittagong on the Bay of Bengal, and it was from this time that a steady process of conversion to Islam of low-caste Hindus began, leading to the eventual preponderance of Muslims over much of Bengal.

In the time of Muḥammad b. Tughluq, Bengal came to be ruled by Fakhr al-Dīn Mubārak Shāh at Sonārgā'on in the east and 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Alī at Lakhnawatī in the west, and henceforth for over two centuries independent sultans controlled Bengal. Under the Ilyāsids, the Islamic arts and sciences flourished, and commerce in Bengal's textiles and foodstuffs was encouraged. In the first decade of the fifteenth century, Ghiyāth al-Dīn A'zam Shāh renewed old diplomatic and cultural links with China, and the growth of the port of Chittagong probably reflects increased trade with the lands farther east. The reign of the Ilyāsids was interrupted for over twenty years by the seizure of power by Rājā Gaṇeśa, a local Hindu landlord of Bengal; his son became a Muslim and ruled as Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad, and despite their Hindu origins the family was able to rule with some Muslim support. Under the restored Ilyāsids, the influence of Ḥabashī or black palace guards grew, until in 892/1487 their commander, the eunuch Sultān Shāhzāda, murdered the last Ilyāsīd and seized power for himself.

Order was eventually restored by Sayyid 'Alā' al-Dīn Ḥusayn Shāh, whose enlightened rule came opportunely after the chaos of the Ḥabashī period. Bihār

was annexed; asylum given to the Sharqī ruler of Jawnpur, dispossessed by the Lōdis of Delhi (see below, no. 164, and above, no. 160, 5), and the Jawnpur troops added to the Bengal army. The growth of a vernacular Bengali literature was a process continuing during these centuries, and royal encouragement is seen in Nuṣrat Shāh b. Sayyid Ḥusayn's patronage of a Bengali translation of the *Mahābhārata*. The line of Sayyid Ḥusayn was ended by the meteoric rise of the Afghan chief Shīr Shāh Sūr, who took over Bengal and used it as a base from which to eject the Mughal Humāyūn from India (see above, no. 160, 6, and below, no. 175). But once the Mughals were firmly re-established in Lahore and Delhi and the Afghans defeated, Mughal influence began to be felt in Bengal. Sulaymān Kararānī, the former governor of southern Bihār, acknowledged the suzerainty of Akbar, and in 984/1576 Bengal was overrun and incorporated in the Mughal empire, becoming one of its *ṣūbas* or provinces.

Lane-Poole, 305–8; Zambaur, 286, 289.

*ET*² 'Bangāla' (A. H. Dani); 'Hind. IV. History' (J. Burton-Page).

R. C. Majumdar et al. (eds), *The History and Culture of the Indian People*. VI. *The Delhi Sultanate*, ch. 10 E.

M. Habib and K. A. Nizami (eds), *A Comprehensive History of India*. V. *The Delhi Sultanat (A.D. 1206–1526)*, chs 2 iv and 19.

Sir Jadu-Nath Sarkar, *The History of Bengal, Muslim Period 1200–1757*, Patna 1973, chs 2–7.

Mohammad Yusuf Siddiq, *Arabian and Persian Texts of the Islamic Inscriptions of Bengal*, Watertown MA 1991.

idem, *al-Nuqūsh al-'arabiyya fī 'l-Banghāl wa-atharuhā al-ḥaḍarī*, Beirut 1996.

1. The line of Shāh Mīr Swātī

- 739/1339 Shāh Mīr Swātī, Shams al-Dīn
 743/1342 Jamshīd b. Shāh Mīr
 745/1344 'Alī Shīr b. Shāh Mīr, 'Alā' al-Dīn
 755/1354 Shīrāshāmak b. 'Alī Shīr, Shihāb al-Dīn
 775/1374 Hindal b. 'Alī Shīr, Qutb al-Dīn
 792/1390 Sikandar b. Hindal, But-shikan, until 795/1393 under the
 regency of his mother Sura
 ◊ 813/1410 'Alī Mīr Khān b. Sikandar, ruled as 'Alī Shāh
 ◊ 823/1420 Shāhī Khān b. Sikandar, ruled as Sultan Zayn al-'Ābidīn,
 called Bud Shāh 'Great King'
 ◊ 875/1470 Hājī Khān b. Zayn al-'Ābidīn, ruled as Haydar Shāh
 ◊ 876/1472 Hasan Shāh b. Haydar
 889/1484 Muḥammad Shāh b. Hasan, first reign
 ◊ 892/1487 Faṭḥ Shāh b. Ad'ham Khān b. Zayn al-'Ābidīn, first reign
 ◊ 904/1499 Muḥammad b. Hasan, second reign
 910/1505 Faṭḥ Shāh b. Ad'ham Khān, second reign
 922/1516 Muḥammad Shāh b. Hasan, third reign
 934/1528 Ibrāhīm Shāh b. Muḥammad, first reign
 935/1529 Nāzūk or Nādir Shāh b. Faṭḥ
 ◊ 936/1530 Muḥammad Shāh b. Hasan, fourth reign
 943/1537 Shams al-Dīn b. Muḥammad
 947/1540 Ismā'il Shāh b. Muḥammad, first reign
 947-58/1540-51 *Mīrzā Haydar Dughlat, governor for the Mughal Humāyūn*
 958/1551 Nāzūk Shāh b. Ibrāhīm, second reign
 ◊ 959/1552 Ibrāhīm Shāh b. Muḥammad, second reign
 ◊ 962/1555 Ismā'il Shāh b. Muḥammad, second reign
 964-8/1557-61 Ḥabīb Shāh b. Ismā'il, deposed by Ghāzī Khān Chak

2. The line of Ghāzī Shāh Chak

- 968/1561 Ghāzī Khān Chak, ruled as Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn
 971/1563 Husayn Shāh, Nāṣir al-Dīn, brother of Muḥammad Ghāzī
 978/1570 Muḥammad 'Alī Shāh, Zāhir al-Dīn, brother of
 Muḥammad Ghāzī and Husayn
 ◊ 987/1579 Yūsuf Shāh b. 'Alī, Nāṣir al-Dīn, d. in Bihār 1000/1592
 994-6/1586-8 Ya'qūb Shāh b. Yūsuf, d. 1001/1593
 996/1588 *Definitive Mughal conquest*

Because of its geographical position, separated by high mountain barriers from the plains of northern India, Kashmīr was long sheltered from Muslim raids. It remained under its own dynasty of Hindu rulers long after most of northern India had passed under Muslim control. Maḥmūd of Ghazna (see above, no. 158) made

two attempts to invade Kashmīr from the south, but was held up on both occasions by the fortress of Lohkot. However, Muslim Turkish mercenaries (*Turuška*) began to be employed by the Hindu kings of Kashmīr, and the process of Islamisation, which has given the province today an overwhelmingly Muslim population, must have tentatively begun.

In 735/1335, the throne there was seized by Shāh Mīr Swātī, a Muslim adventurer who was probably of Pathan origin and who had been minister to Rājā Sinha Deva. The régime of Shams al-Dīn (this being the honorific which Shāh Mīr adopted) was tolerant and mild towards the majority Hindus, but his grandson Sikandar was a Muslim zealot who patronised the '*ulama*' and scholars and who persecuted the Hindus, destroying their temples and earning for himself the epithet *But-shikan* 'Idol-breaker'. Already before this, the Kubrawī Šūfī saint 'Alī Hamadhānī and many Sayyids had arrived in Kashmīr, and during Sikandar's reign the group of Bayhaqī Sayyids, who were to play a prominent role in the religious and intellectual life of the province, migrated from Delhi to Kashmīr. However, his son Zayn al-'Ābidīn reversed this rigorist policy, and his long and enlightened reign was something of a Golden Age for Kashmīr; under his patronage, the *Mahābhārata* and Kalhaṇa's twelfth-century metrical chronicle of Kashmīr, the *Rājataranginī*, were translated into Persian. Unfortunately, his descendants were lesser men, and much internecine strife now followed; various provincial chiefs took advantage of the mountainous and difficult terrain and established a virtual independence. In particular, the influence of the powerful Chak tribe, originally immigrants from Dardistān, grew, its leaders serving as ministers and commanders for the last feeble *fainéant* rulers of Shāh Mīr's line. The Mughal prince Haydar Dughlat invaded Kashmīr in 947/1540, and ruled in Srinagar for ten years on behalf of his kinsman Humāyūn, until he was killed in an uprising. The Chak family was now again in the ascendant, and after 968/1561 they ruled as sovereigns themselves, assuming the title *Pādishāh* 'Monarch' in imitation of the Mughals; their religious inclinations were towards Shī'ism. However, the last two Chaks had to rule as vassals of Akbar until they were finally deposed and Kashmīr fully incorporated into the Mughal empire.

Justi, 478; Sachau, 32–3 nos 89 and 90; Zambaur, 293–4.

*EP*² 'Hind. IV. History' (J. Burton-Page), 'Kashmīr. I. Before 1947' (Mohibbul Hasan), Suppl. 'Čaks' (idem).

Sir T. W. Haig, 'The chronology and genealogy of the Muhammadan Kings of Kashmīr', *JRAS* (1918), 451–68.

Mohibbul Hasan, *Kashmīr under the Sultans*, Calcutta 1959.

R. C. Majumdar et al. (eds), *The History and Culture of the Indian People*. VI. *The Delhi Sultanate*, ch. 13 C.

M. Habib and K. A. Nizami (eds), *A Comprehensive History of India*. V. *The Delhi Sultanat (A.D. 1206–1526)*, ch. 9.

163

THE SULTANS OF GUJARĀT

806–980/1403–1573

Western India

- (793/1391 Zāfar Khān b. Wajīh al-Mulk, governor with the title of Muzaffar Khān)
- 806/1403 Tātār Khān b. Muzaffar, proclaimed himself Sultan with the title of Muḥammad Shāh (I)
- 810/1407 Muzaffar Khān, proclaimed Sultan with the title of Muzaffar Shāh (I)
- o 814/1411 Aḥmad Shāh I b. Muḥammad b. Muzaffar, Shihāb al-Dīn
- o 846/1442 Muḥammad Shāh II Karīm b. Aḥmad
- o 855/1451 Jalāl Khān b. Muḥammad II, succeeded as Aḥmad Shāh (II), Quṭb al-Dīn
- 862/1458 Dāwūd Khān b. Aḥmad I
- o 862/1458 Fath Khān b. Muḥammad II, succeeded as Maḥmūd Shāh I, Begrā, Sayf al-Dīn
- o 917/1511 Khalīl Khān b. Maḥmūd, succeeded as Muzaffar Shāh II
- 932/1526 Sikandar b. Muzaffar II
- 932/1526 Nāṣir Khān b. Muzaffar II, succeeded as Maḥmūd Shāh (II)
- o 932/1526 Bahādur Shāh b. Muzaffar II, first reign
- 941–2/1535–6 *Mughal occupation*
- 942–3/1536–7 Bahādur Shāh, second reign
- o 943/1537 Maḥmūd Shāh III b. Latīf Khān b. Muzaffar II
- o 962/1554 Aḥmad Shāh III, descendant of Aḥmad I, Raḍī 'l-Mulk
- o 968/1561 Muzaffar Shāh III b. ? Maḥmūd III, first reign
- 980/1573 *Mughal conquest*
- o (991/1583 Muzaffar Shāh III, brief second reign, d. 1001/1593)
- 991/1583 *Definitive Mughal conquest*

The mediaeval province of Gujarāt on the western coastland of India comprised both a mainland section lying to the east of the Rann of Cutch (Kachchh) and also the peninsula of Kathiawar. Because of its commercial and maritime connections with the other shores of the Indian Ocean, Gujarāt was a particularly rich province; but although Maḥmūd of Ghazna had marched through it en route for Somnath (see above, no. 158), permanent Muslim conquest was quite long delayed. Only in 697/1298 did the troops of 'Alā' al-Dīn Muḥammad Khalījī defeat the main local Hindu dynasty, the Vāghelās of Anahilwāra. During the fourteenth century, Gujarāt was ruled by governors appointed by the Delhi Sultans, until in 793/1391 the Tughluqid Muḥammad III sent out Zāfar Khān. As the Tughluquids fell into palpable decline, Zāfar Khan became in effect independent, and his son and he claimed the insignia of royalty and the title of Shāh. The new sultanate was consolidated by the founder's grandson Aḥmad I, much of whose reign was occupied by warfare against the Hindu Rājās of Gujarāt and Rājputānā and against his fellow-Muslim sovereigns of Mālwa, Khāndesh and the Deccan.

It was he who built for himself the new capital of Aḥmadābād, which replaced that of Anahilwāra. The fifty-five years of Maḥmūd Begfā's reign (862–917/1458–1511) were the greatest in the history of the Gujarāt Sultanate. Campaigns against the Hindu princes led, among other things, to the capture of the fortress of Chāmpānēr, now renamed Maḥmūdābād and made the sultan's capital; indeed, during his reign the Sultanate attained its greatest extent before the subsequent annexation of Mālwa (see below, no. 165)

A new factor in the politics of western and southern India appeared before the end of Maḥmūd's reign, namely the Portuguese. After Vasco da Gama appeared at Calicut (Kalikat) in 1498, the Portuguese began to divert much of the Indian Ocean commerce into their own hands, thus bypassing the traders of Egypt and Gujarāt. Hence in 914/1508 Maḥmūd allied with the Mamlūk Sultan Qānṣūḥ al-Ghawrī (see above, no. 31, 2), but despite the initial Muslim naval victory near Bombay over Dom Lourenço de Almeida, the Portuguese captured Goa from the neighbouring 'Ādil Shāhis of Bījapur (see below, no. 170) and Maḥmūd was compelled to make peace. The last great sultan of Gujarāt was Maḥmūd's grandson Bahādur Shāh, who assumed the offensive against the Hindus and also conquered Mālwa, only to lose it and part of his own dominions to the Mughal Humāyūn. The menace from the Portuguese revived, and despite the grant to them of Diu (Dīw) they treacherously killed Bahādur Shāh in 943/1537. The unity of Gujarāt now crumbled; dynastic quarrels broke out, and the kingdom began to split up among various nobles. In despair, the Mughals were called in so that Akbar took over Gujarāt in 980/1572–3 and made it into a province of his empire, although the last sultan of Gujarāt, Muẓaffar III, made several attempts at a revanche up to his death in 1001/1593.

Justi, 476; Lane-Poole, 312–14; Zambaur, 296.

Et² 'Gudjarāt' (J. Burton-Page), 'Hind. IV. History' (idem).

G. P. Taylor, 'The coins of the Gujarāt saltanat', *JBBRAS*, 21 (1903), 278–338, with a genealogical table at p. 308.

M. S. Commissariat, *History of Gujarat. Including a Survey of its Chief Architectural Monuments and Inscriptions. I. From A.D. 1297–8 to A.D. 1573*, Bombay etc. 1938, with a chronological table and chronological list of rulers at pp. 564–5.

R. C. Majumdar et al. (eds), *The History and Culture of the Indian People. VI. The Delhi Sultanate*, ch. 10 A.

M. Habib and K. A. Nizami (eds), *A Comprehensive History of India. V. The Delhi Sultanat (A.D. 1206–1506)*, ch. 11.

- 796/1394 Malik Sarwar, Khwāja-yi Jahān
 ○ 802/1399 Malik Qaranful Mubārak Shāh, adopted son of Malik Sarwar
 ○ 804/1401 Ibrāhīm, Shams al-Dīn, brother of Mubārak Shāh
 ○ 844/1440 Maḥmūd Shāh b. Ibrāhīm
 ○ 862/1458 Bhikan Khān b. Maḥmūd Shāh, ruled as Muḥammad Shāh
 ○ 862–88/1458–83 Husayn Shāh b. Maḥmūd Shāh, d. 911/1505
 888/1483 *Conquest by the Delhi Sultans*

Jawnpur lies on the Gumtī river to the north of Benares, between what were later the provinces of Bihār and Oudh (Awadh), hence in what is now the eastern part of Uttar Pradesh State, and is traditionally said to have been founded in 762/1359 by the Tughluqid Fīrūz Shāh III and named after his cousin and patron Muḥammad b. Tughluq, one of whose names was Jawna (< *Yāvana* 'foreigner') Shāh. In the fifteenth century it became the centre of a powerful Muslim state, situated between the Sultanates of Delhi and Bengal, and the Sultans of Jawnpur played a significant rôle in developing the Islamic culture of the region; Jawnpur, indeed, became known as 'the Shirāz of the East'.

The dynasty was founded by one Malik Sarwar, the eunuch slave minister of the last Tughluqid Maḥmūd Shāh II, who conquered Oudh on behalf of his master in 796/1394 and then remained there as virtual ruler, persuading the sultan to grant him the title of *Malik al-Sharq* 'King of the East', whence the name of the dynasty. Helped by the chaos which followed Tīmūr's invasion of India, his adopted son Mubārak Shāh behaved as a fully independent ruler, minting his own coins and having the bidding prayers in the *khutba* or Friday sermon made in his own name alone. His brother Ibrāhīm was the greatest of the Sharqīs, and during his reign of nearly forty years the dynasty reached a peak of affluence and power. A particularly fine school of Indo-Muslim architecture developed in Jawnpur, and, being himself a man of culture, Ibrāhīm encouraged scholars and literary men at his court. His successors were drawn into warfare with the Lōdī Sultans of Delhi and raided Gwalior (Gwāliyār), but were most successful in attacking Orissa (Uṛīsā). According to Muslim chronicles, Jawnpur had at this time one of the largest armies in India. The last Sharqī sultan, Husayn Shāh, reached the gates of Delhi on one occasion, but Bahlūl and Sikandar Lōdī were in the end too much for him. Sikandar defeated Husayn, who fled to Bengal and lived out his life in a small district granted to him by the Bengal Sultan 'Alā' al-Dīn Husayn Shāh (see above, no. 161, 7). Jawnpur thus passed under the control of the Lōdī Sultan, who deliberately destroyed the city's fine buildings left by the Sharqīs. Husayn Shāh's descendants had irredentist hopes of regaining the kingdom, hopes which the Mughals were not disposed to satisfy, although Bābur and Humāyūn did permit them to style themselves sultans.

Lane-Poole, 309; Zambaur, 292.

*EP*² 'Djawnpur' (J. Burton-Page), 'Hind. IV. History' (idem), 'Sharkis' (K. A. Nizami).

H. M. Whittell, 'The coinage of the Sharqi Kings of Jaunpūr', *JASB*, new series, 18 (1922), Numismatic Suppl., pp. N.10–N.35.

M. M. Saeed, *The Sharqi Sultanate of Jaunpur: A Political and Cultural History*, Karachi 1972, with Appx A on coinage at pp. 293–301 and a genealogical table as Appx C at pp. 306–7.

R. C. Majumdar et al. (eds), *The History and Culture of the Indian People*. VI. *The Delhi Sultanate*, ch. 10 D.

M. Habib and K. A. Nizami (eds), *A Comprehensive History of India*. V. *The Delhi Sultanat (A.D. 1206–1506)*, ch. 8.

165

THE SULTANS AND RULERS OF MĀLWA 804–969/1402–1562 *Central India*

1. The line of the Ghūrīs

- (793/1391 Dilāwar Khān Ḥasan Ghūrī, governor for the Delhi Sultans)
804/1402 Dilāwar Khān, as ‘Amīd Shāh Dāwūd
o 809/1406 Alp Khān b. Dilāwar, succeeded as Hūshang Shāh
838/1435 Ghaznī Khān b. Alp, succeeded as Muḥammad Shāh Ghūrī
839/1436 Mas‘ūd Khān b. Muḥammad

2. The line of the Khaljīs

- o 839/1436 Maḥmūd Khān, succeeded as Maḥmūd Shāh (I) Khaljī
o 873/1469 Ghiyāth al-Dīn Shāh b. Maḥmūd
o 906–16/1501–10 Nāṣir al-Dīn Shāh b. Ghiyāth al-Dīn, ‘Abd al-Qādir
o 917–37/1511–31 Maḥmūd Shāh II b. Nāṣir al-Dīn, after 924/1518 as a vassal of the Sultans of Gujarāt
937–41/1531–5 *Occupation by Gujarāt*

3. Various governors and independent rulers

- 939/1533 Mallū Khān, governor for Gujarāt in 939/1533 and then independent as Qādir Shāh
949/1542 Shajā‘at Khān, governor for the Delhi Sultan Shīr Shāh Sūr, first period of power
952/1545 ‘Isā Khān, governor for Islām Shāh Sūr
961/1554 Shajā‘at Khān, governor for Muḥammad ‘Ādil Shāh Sūr, second period of power, independent in 962/1555
o 962–9/1555–62 Miyān Bāyazīd b. Shajā‘at Khān, Bāz Bahādur
969/1562 *Definitive Mughal conquest*

Mediaeval Indian Mālwa was the plateau region of western Central India, which formed a triangle with the Vindhya range as its base, hence it corresponded to what is now largely within the westernmost part of Madhya Pradesh State. Muslim rule was only established there after long and bloody struggles with the local Rājput rulers of Chitōr and Ujjain. In 705/1305, the Delhi Sultan ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Khaljī despatched an army which subjugated Mālwa, and thereafter governors were sent out to the region from Delhi. The Afghan governor Dilāwar Khān Ghūrī sheltered the refugee Tughluqid Maḥmūd Shāh II during Tīmūr’s invasion of northern India in 801/1398–9, but the shock to the fabric of the Delhi Sultanate at this time permitted Dilāwar Khān shortly afterwards to declare his independence and assume the insignia of royalty. The circumstances of Mālwa’s achievement of independence thus parallel those of the rise of the Sharqīs in Jawnpur (see

above, no. 164). The Mālwa Sultans made their capital the inaccessible and heavily-defended fortress of Māndū, and adorned the city which grew up there with many splendid buildings.

At one point, the Ghūrī sultans undertook a raid as far as Hindu Orissa, but most of their military activity was against nearby Rājput chiefs and neighbouring Muslim rulers, including the Sharqīs, the Gujarāt Sultans, the Sayyid Sultans of Delhi and the Bahmanids of the Deccan; in this warfare against Muslim rivals, they did not hesitate to ally with Hindu princes. In 839/1436, the chief minister Maḥmūd Khān took over the throne in Mālwa (the last Ghūrī sultan fleeing to Gujarāt) and began the line of the Khaljīs there. Maḥmūd I Khaljī was the greatest of the Mālwa Sultans, and despite several setbacks in his campaigns against the Rājputs of Chitōr and the Bahmanids he expanded his territories considerably. His fame spread beyond the subcontinent; he received a formal investiture of power from the *fainéant* 'Abbāsīd caliph in Cairo al-Mustanjid (see above, no. 3, 3), and embassies were exchanged with the Tīmūrid sultan in Herat, Abū Sa'īd (see above, no. 144, 1). But during the reign of his great-grandson Maḥmūd II, there arose an ascendancy of Rājput ministers and courtiers in the state, such as that of the sultan's vizier Mēdinī Rā'ī, and tensions between Muslim and Hindu elements grew. At one point, Maḥmūd was captured by the Rājā of Chitōr, and, though he was restored in Mālwa, his kingdom fell in 937/1531 to Bahādur Shah of Gujarāt (see above, no. 163).

During the next three decades, there were several governors acting for the Gujarāt Sultans and then the Delhi Sultans, some of whom managed to make themselves at times independent, until the last such ruler, Bāz Bahādur, was defeated by Akbar's forces and Mālwa was incorporated into the Mughal empire as one of its provinces.

Justi, 477; Lane-Poole, 310–11; Zambaur, 292.

EF² 'Hind. IV. History' (J. Burton-Page), 'Mālwa' (T. W. Haig and Riazul Islam).

L. White King, 'History and coinage of Malwa', *NC*, 4th series, 3 (1903), 356–98, with a genealogical table and a chronological list of rulers at pp. 359–60; also 4 (1904), 62–100.

U. N. Day, *Medieval Malwa: A Political and Cultural History 1401–1557*, Delhi 1965.

R. C. Majumdar et al. (eds), *The History and Culture of the Indian People*. VI. *The Delhi Sultanate*, ch. 10 C.

M. Habib and K. A. Nizami (eds), *A Comprehensive History of India*. V. *The Delhi Sultanat (A.D. 1206–1526)*, ch. 12.

- o 734/1334 Sharīf Aḥsan, Jalāl al-Dīn, governor since 723/1323, then independent
- o 739/1338 'Alā' al-Dīn Udayji
- o 740/1339 Firūz Shāh, Qutb al-Dīn, nephew and son-in-law of 'Alā' al-Dīn
- o 740/1339 Muḥammad Dāmghān Shāh, Ghiyāth al-Dīn, son-in-law of Sharīf Aḥsan
- o 745/1344 Maḥmūd Dāmghān Shāh, Naṣir al-Dīn, nephew and son-in-law of Muḥammad Dāmghān Shāh
- o by 757/1356 'Ādil Shāh, Abu 'l-Muẓaffar Shams al-Dīn
- o by 761/1360 Mubārak Shāh, Fakhr al-Dīn, possibly a Bahmanid
- o c. 774–9/c. 1372–7 Sikandar Shāh, 'Alā' al-Dīn
- c. 779/c. 1377 *Conquest by Vijayanagara*

The region known to the mediaeval Islamic geographers as Ma'bar covered the lower south-eastern coastland of the Deccan, roughly corresponding to the later Coromandel. Madura, which became its capital, was conquered by an army sent by the Delhi Sultan Muḥammad b. Tughluq in 723/1323, and the governor installed there began some years later an independent line of Sultans of Ma'bar. The Moroccan traveller Ibn Baṭṭūṭa stayed there in 743/1342 after being at the Tughluqid court in Delhi, en route for China, and married a princess of the Ma'bar ruling family. By the mid-fourteenth century, the Sultans seem also to have controlled the southern tip of the Deccan round westwards as far as Cochin. The Sultanate was always under threat from powerful Hindu neighbours, in particular, from the early 1350s onwards, from the kingdom of Vijayanagara situated to its north, and this last seems to have overwhelmed the Sultanate by 779/1377 or shortly afterwards.

*EP*² 'Hind. IV. History' (J. Burton-Page), 'Ma'bar' (A. D. W. Forbes).

R. C. Majumdar et al. (eds), *The History and Culture of the Indian People*. VI. *The Delhi Sultanate*, ch. 10 H.II.

M. Habib and K. A. Nizami (eds), *A Comprehensive History of India*. V. *The Delhi Sultanat (A.D. 1206–1526)*, ch. 15.

Haroon Khan Sherwani and P. M. Joshi (eds), *History of Medieval Deccan (1295–1724)*, Hyderabad 1973, I, 57–75.

319

independent and founded the Sultanate of Ma'bar or Madura (see above, no. 166). Much more powerful and enduring was the state founded on the table-land of the northern Deccan by the Amīr Ḥasan Gangū. Ḥasan's origins are very obscure, but they seem to have been humble ones; the claim to Persian descent, seen in his assumption of the old Iranian name of Bahman (in the Iranian national epic, son of Isfandiyār), should not be taken seriously. After his successful rebellion in Dawlatābād, Ḥasan transferred his capital southwards to Gulbargā, and for over eighty years this remained the Bahmanid capital.

The rise of the Bahmanids meant that a strong and aggressive Muslim power now confronted the two chief Hindu kingdoms of the southern Decca, Warangal and Vijayanagar. For the next century or so, warfare was frequent, ending in the case of Warangal by its overthrow in 830/1425 by Aḥmad Shāh I and its incorporation into the Bahmanid Sultanate; Vijayanagar, on the other hand, which had already overwhelmed the Sultanate of Ma'bar or Madura (see above, no. 166), was never conquered at this time.

A point of note in this warfare was the use from the second half of the fourteenth century onwards of artillery and firearms, knowledge of these weapons being acquired through South India's connections with lands further west. After the conquest of Warangal, Aḥmad moved his capital to the more central Bīdar, and he also carried the war northwards against the Muslim rulers of Gujarāt and Mālwa. The Bahmanid Sultanate was until the second half of the fifteenth century essentially a land-locked kingdom of the northern Deccan, but Muḥammad Shāh III's energetic chief minister, the Khwāja-yi Jahān Maḥmūd Gāwān, who was of Persian origin, allied with Gujarāt against the Sultanate's enemies, intervened successfully in Orissa and extended the kingdom's eastern boundary to the Bay of Bengal, and extended its western one over the Western Ghats to Goa and the Arabian Sea coast.

The Bahmanids thus acquired considerable fame in the Islamic world at large, especially as they made their court a great centre of learning; it was also under them that a specific Deccani style of Indo-Muslim architecture evolved. The Bahmanids were the first power of the subcontinent to exchange ambassadors with the Ottomans (between Muḥammad Shāh III and Muḥammad II Fātiḥ). The Bahmanid state, as well as being militarily powerful, had an effective civil administrative system. There was, accordingly, a need for skilled personnel, and many Turks, Persians, Arabs, etc., entered the sultans' service. It was through this influx that there arose in the fifteenth century tensions between the native Deccani Muslims (the *Dakhnīs* or *Deshīs*) and the 'outsiders' (the *Āfāqīs* or *Gharībān* or *Pardeshīs*). Mounting internal chaos in the state and increasing ineffectiveness of the rulers are in part explicable by these rivalries. Toward the end of the fifteenth century, after the unwise execution by the sultan of Maḥmūd Gāwān, signs of disintegration began to appear. The last four sultans were *fainéants* under the tutelage of the Turkish amīr 'Alī Baridī; the fourth of these, Kalīm Allāh, appealed unsuccessfully to the Mughal Bābur for help in throwing off the yoke of the Baridīs, and finally had to abandon his dominions for exile in Bījapur.

From the ruins of the Bahmanid Sultanate there emerged in the Muslim Deccan five successor states, all sprung from the commanders or officials of the Bahmanids: the 'Imād Shāhīs of Berār, the Barid Shāhīs of Bīdar, the 'Adil Shāhīs

of Bijapur, the Nizām Shāhīs of Aḥmadnagar and the Qutb Shāhīs of Golconda (Golkondā) (see below, nos 169–73). The 'Imād Shāhīs were absorbed by the Nizām Shāhīs in the later sixteenth century, but the other four sultanates continued into the seventeenth century, in two instances until the time of the Mughal Awrangzīb, all of them eventually forming part of that Emperor's vast but ephemeral empire.

Justi, 470; Lane-Poole, 316–21; Zambaur, 297–9.

^{EP} 'Bahmanīs' (H. K. Sherwani).

E. E. Speight, 'The coins of the Bahmani Kings of the Deccan', *IC*, 9 (1935), 268–307.

Haroon Khan Sherwani, *The Bahmanis of the Deccan: An Objective Study*, Hyderabad-Deccan 1953, with a chronology of events and the rulers at pp. 435–44 and a detailed genealogical table at the end.

R. C. Majumdar et al. (eds), *The History and Culture of the Indian People*. VI. *The Delhi Sultanate*, ch. 11.

M. Habib and K. A. Nizami (eds), *A Comprehensive History of India*. V. *The Delhi Sultanat (A.D. 1206–1526)*, ch. 14.

H. K. Sherwani and P. M. Joshi (eds), *History of Medieval Deccan (1295–1724)*, I, 141–222, with a detailed genealogical table at p. 142, II, 432–9.

THE FĀRŪQĪ RULERS OF KHĀNDESH

c. 784–1009/c. 1382–1601

The north-west Deccan

c. 784/c. 1382 Malik Rājā Aḥmad Fārūqī b. ? Khwaja-yi Jahān A'zam
Humāyūn

○ 801/1399 Nāṣir Khān b. Rājā Aḥmad

841/1437 Mirzā 'Adil Khān I b. Nāṣir

844/1441 Mirān Mubārak Khān I b. 'Adil I

861/1457 'Adil Khān II 'Aynā b. Mubārak

907/1501 Dāwūd Khān b. Mubārak

914/1508 Ghaznī Khān b. Dāwūd

914/1508 'Ālam Khān, of Aḥmadnagar

914/1509 'Adil Khān III 'Ālam Khān A'zam Humāyūn b. Aḥsan
Khān, descendant of Nāṣir Khān's brother Iftikhār

Khān Ḥasan b. Rājā Aḥmad

926/1520 Mirān Muḥammad Shāh I b. 'Adil III

943/1537 Aḥmad Shāh b. Muḥammad I

943/1537 Mubārak Shāh II b. 'Adil III

974/1566 Mirān Muḥammad Shāh II b. Mubārak II

984/1576 Rājā 'Alī Khān 'Adil Shāh IV

1005–9/1597–1601 Bahādur Shāh b. 'Adil Shāh IV, d. 1033/1624

1009/1600–1 *Mughal conquest*

Mediaeval Islamic Khāndesh was essentially the region in the north-west of the Deccan south of the Narbada river and straddling the middle and upper basin of the Tāptī; its neighbours on the north were Gujarāt and Mālwa, and on the south the Bahmanids and their successors. It owed its name 'Land of the Khāns' to its Fārūqī rulers, who were not admitted to the rank of Sultan by their more powerful neighbours but were known by the lesser title of Khān and often referred to by the other powers as *ḥākīm* or *wālī*. Before the first Muslim conquest, the region had been held by the Yādavas or the Chawhāns.

The founder of the Muslim line, Malik Rājā Aḥmad, had a background of service with the Bahmanids, but then transferred to the court of the Delhi Sultan Fīrūz Shāh III and was appointed by the latter governor over certain districts in the northern Deccan. In the confusion of the declining years of the Tughluqids, Malik Rājā followed the example of his neighbour in Mālwa, Dilāwar Khān (see above, no. 165), and asserted his independence. Since he claimed descent from the second caliph 'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, who had the by-name *al-Fārūq* 'the Just' (see above, no. 1), his successors called themselves the Fārūqīs. His son Nāṣir Khān captured the fortress of Asīrgaṛh from its Hindu chief, and built close by it the town of Burhānpur, henceforth the capital of the rulers of Khāndesh. Under 'Adil Khān II, Khāndesh flourished exceedingly; he failed to throw off the suzerainty of the Sultans of Gujarāt, but he did extend his power eastwards against the Hindu Rājās of Gondwāna and Jhārkand, and his exploits earned him the title *Shāh-i Jhārkand* 'King of the Forest'.

In the early years of the sixteenth century, Khāndesh was racked by succession disputes, which conduced to the intervention of outside powers, especially of the Gujarāt Sultans and the successors of the Bahmanids in Aḥmadnagar, the Nizām Shāhis of Berār (see below, no. 171). With limited manpower and economic resources available to them, the Fārūqīs only survived while they could pursue an adroit diplomatic policy between their mightier neighbours. This often involved conciliating the Sultans of Gujarāt, and at one point Mīrān Muḥammad I was designated heir-presumptive to the throne in Gujarāt; he died, however, before this claim could be consolidated. The first clash of the Fārūqīs with the Mughals came in 962/1555, and ten years later the Fārūqīs became vassals of Akbar. After c. 993/c. 1585, direct Mughal pressure grew. Bahādur Shāh offended the Mughals, and his fortress of Asīrgarh was in 1009/1600 captured by Akbar and the surviving Fārūqīs carried off into exile. Khāndesh now became a province of the Mughal empire, for a time renamed Dāndesh after Akbar's son Dāniyāl.

Justi, 477; Lane-Poole, 315; Zambaur, 295.

*Et*² 'Fārūkids' (P. Hardy), 'Hind. IV. History' (J. Burton-Page), 'Khāndesh' (idem).

T. W. Haig, 'The Faruqi dynasty of Khandesh', *The Indian Antiquary*, 47 (1918), 113–24, 141–9, 178–86.

R. C. Majumdar et al. (eds), *The History and Culture of the Indian People*. VI. *The Delhi Sultanate*, ch. 10 B.

M. Habib and K. A. Nizami (eds), *A Comprehensive History of India*. V. *The Delhi Sultanat (A.D. 1206–1526)*, ch. 11.

H. K. Sherwani and P. M. Joshi (eds), *History of Medieval Deccan*, I, 491–516, with a genealogical table at p. 493.

169

THE BARĪD SHĀHĪS
c. 892–1028/c. 1487–1619
Bīdar

- (892/1487 Qāsim I Barīd, chief minister of the Bahmanid Sultan)
- 910/1504 Amīr Barīd I b. Qāsim, nominal vassal of the last Bahmanids
- 950/1543 ‘Alī b. Amīr Barīd, proclaimed his independence as Malik al-Mulūk
- ø 987/1579 Ibrāhīm b. ‘Alī
- ø ?997/1589 Qāsim II
- ?1000/1592 Mīrzā ‘Alī b. Qāsim II
- ø ?1018/1609 Amīr Barīd II
- ?1018–28/1609–19 Mīrzā Walī Amīr Barīd III
- 1028/1619 Annexation by the ‘Ādil Shāhīs

Bīdar lay in the central Deccan, to the north-west of Hyderabad City, and is now just within the north-eastern tip of Karnataka State. Qāsim Barīd was originally a Turkish slave in the service of the Bahmanids, but towards the end of the fifteenth century rose to become one of the dominating influences in the decaying Sultanate. His family continued to recognise the last titular rulers of the Bahmanids, until ‘Alī Barīd finally proclaimed himself an independent prince. Bīdar had a strategically important situation, and the Bahmanids had adorned it with fine buildings, a process continued by the Barīd Shāhīs. The fortunes of these last – who remained, unlike some others of their fellow-princes of the Deccan, resolutely Sunnī in faith – declined after ‘Alī’s death, and the ‘Ādil Shāhīs of Bījapur (see below, no. 170) seized Bīdar in 1028/1619 and ended the Barīd Shāhīs; thirty-seven years later, Bīdar fell to the Mughal Awrangzīb.

Lane-Poole, 318, 321; Zambaur, 298.

Et² ‘Barīd Shāhīs’ (H. K. Sherwani), ‘Bīdar’ (H. K. Sherwani and J. Burton-Page); ‘Hind. IV. History’ (Burton-Page).

Gulam Yazdani, *Bīdar: Its History and Monuments*, Oxford 1947, ch. 1.

H. K. Sherwani and P. M. Joshi (eds), *History of Medieval Deccan (1295–1724)*, I, 289–394, with a genealogical table at p. 290, II, 446–7.

R. C. Majumdar (ed.), *The History and Culture of the Indian People*. VII. *The Mughul Empire (1526–1707 A.D.)*, Bombay 1974, ch. 14 V.

170

THE 'ĀDIL SHĀHĪS 895–1097/1490–1686 *Bijapur*

- 895/1490 Yūsuf 'Ādil Khān, previously governor for the
Bahmanids in Dawlatābād by 874/1470
916/1510 Ismā'il b. Yūsuf
941/1534 Mallū b. Ismā'il
941/1535 Ibrāhīm I b. Ismā'il
o 965/1558 'Alī I b. Ibrāhīm I
o 987/1579 Ibrāhīm II b. Tahmāsp b. Ibrāhīm I
o 1035/1626 Muḥammad b. Ibrāhīm II
1066/1656 'Alī II b. Muḥammad
1083–97/1672–86 Sikandar b. 'Alī, d. 1111/1700
1097/1686 *Mughal conquest*

Bijapur was situated in the western part of the Bahmanid Sultanate, and is now near the northern boundary of Karnataka State. Like the founder of the 'Imād Shāhīs, Daryā Khān (see below, no. 172), Yūsuf Khān was a commander and provincial governor for the Bahmanids, originally a slave in the service of Muḥammad III's minister Maḥmūd Gāwān (see above, no. 167), who proclaimed his independence in 895/1489. He may well have been of Persian origin, though the story in historians partial to the 'Ādil Shāhīs that he was of Ottoman royal blood is fanciful. He was certainly the first ruler to introduce Shī'ism into South India, and this became the faith of three out of the five successor-states to the Bahmanids there.

The history of the 'Ādil Shāhīs is one of almost continuous warfare with their Muslim neighbours and with the Hindu kingdom of Vijayanagar. The capital Bijapur nevertheless became a splendid centre for learning and the arts, adorned with fine buildings erected by the Shāhs, while the florescence there of Persian literature accelerated the process whereby much of Muslim South India became culturally Persianised. By the mid-seventeenth century, Bijapur was under pressure from the militant Marāthās, and from 1046/1636 its rulers had to acknowledge Mughal suzerainty; then in 1097/1686 Awrangzib captured Bijapur, brought the line of Shāhs to an end and incorporated their dominions into his own empire.

Justi, 470; Lane-Poole, 318, 321; Zambaur, 298–9.

EP² 'Ādil-Shāhīs' (P. Hardy), 'Bīdījāpūr' (A. S. Bazmee Ansari), 'Hind. IV. History' (J. Burton-Page).

H. K. Sherwani and P. M. Joshi (eds), *History of Medieval Deccan (1295–1724)*, I, 289–394, with a genealogical table at p. 290, II, 441–3.

R. C. Majumdar (ed.), *The History and Culture of the Indian People. VII. The Mughul Empire*, ch. 14 III.

171

THE NIZĀM SHĀHIS 895–1046/1490–1636 *Aḥmadnagar*

- 895/1490 Aḥmad Nizām Shāh Bahārī b. Timma Bhaṭṭ Nizām
al-Mulk Ḥasan, minister of the Bahmanids,
proclaimed his independence
- 915/1509 Burhān I b. Aḥmad
- 961/1554 Ḥusayn I b. Burhān
- 972/1565 Murtaḍā I b. Ḥusayn I
- 997/1589 Ḥusayn II b. Murtaḍā I
- 998/1590 Ismāʿīl b. Burhān II, cousin of Ḥusayn II
- 999/1591 Burhān II b. Ḥusayn b. Burhān I
- 1003/1595 Ibrāhīm b. Burhān II
- 1004–9/1595–1600 Bahādur b. Ibrāhīm
- 1009/1600 *Mughal capture of Aḥmadnagar*
- 1009/1600 Murtaḍā II b. ʿAlī b. Burhān I
- 1019/1610 Burhān III
- 1041–3/1632–3 Ḥusayn III b. Murtaḍā II
- 1046/1636 *Division of the Nizām Shāhī territories between
the Mughals and the ʿĀdil Shāhīs*

Aḥmadnagar is on the Deccan plateau to the east of Bombay in what is now Maharashtra State. It was founded as the capital of the Bahmanid successor state by Aḥmad Nizām, son of the vizier to Maḥmūd Bahman Shāh, and named after himself. Aḥmad asserted his independence at Aḥmadnagar during the years of the dynasty's decline. His son Burhān adopted Shīʿism, thus aligning his principality with those of the ʿĀdil Shāhīs and Quṭb Shāhīs, and the ruling family was henceforth intermittently Shīʿī. During the sixteenth century, the Nizām Shāhīs were involved in fighting with their Muslim rivals and with Vijayanagar, but from the end of that century decline set in, there was a rapid turnover of rulers, and the Mughals captured Aḥmadnagar in 1009/1600. The last Nizām Shāhīs ruled under the ascendancy of the Ḥabashī or black African slave commander Malik ʿAmbar, under whose able direction the Nizām Shāhī fortunes revived. But after his death in 1035/1626, Mughal pressure became intense, and in 1046/1636 the Emperor Shāh Jahān and Muḥammad ʿĀdil Shāhī, alarmed at the Marāṭhā threat, divided the Nizām Shāhī territories between themselves.

Justi, 471; Lane-Poole, 318, 329; Zambaur, 298–9.

EP² 'Hind. IV. History' (J. Burton-Page), 'Nizām Shāhīs' (Marie H. Martin).

Radhey Shyam, *The Kingdom of Aḥmadnagar*, Varanasi 1966.

H. K. Sherwani and P. M. Joshi (eds), *History of Medieval Deccan (1295–1724)*, I, 223–77, with a genealogical table at p. 225, II, 439–41.

R. C. Majumdar (ed.), *The History and Culture of the Indian People*. VII. *The Mughul Empire*, ch. 14 II.

172

THE 'IMĀD SHĀHĪS 896-982/1491-1574 *Berār*

- 890/1485 Fath Allāh Daryā Khān, 'Imād al-Mulk, governor for the Bahmanīs in Berār since 876/1471
890/1485 'Alā' al-Dīn b. Fath Allāh, assumed the title of Shāh in 896/1491
939/1533 Daryā b. 'Alā' al-Dīn
969-82/1562-74 Burhān b. Daryā, under the regency of Tufāl Khān Dakhnī
982/1574 *Conquest by the Nizām Shāhīs*

The extensive district of Berār comprised the northern region of the Bahmanid Sultanate, now the easternmost part of Maharashtra State. The founder of the 'Imād Shāhī principality there, Daryā Khān, was a Hindu convert in the service of the Bahmanids, who was made governor of Berār and who became latterly one of the powers behind the throne as the Sultanate became increasingly enfeebled. He eventually asserted his independence as ruler of Berār, with his capital at Elichpur. Together with that of the Barīd Shāhīs (see above, no. 169), Daryā Khān's was the only Sunnī principality among the Deccani successor-states to the Bahmanids. The history of the 'Imād Shāhīs during the eighty years or so of their independence was filled with warfare with their neighbours, such as the 'Adil Shāhīs and Nizām Shāhīs. Eventually, the Nizām Shāhīs absorbed the 'Imād Shāhīs, but in the early seventeenth century Berār was conquered by Akbar and passed into Mughal hands.

Lane-Poole, 318, 320; Zambaur, 298.

*El*² 'Berār' (C. Collin Davies), 'Hind. IV. History' (J. Burton-Page), 'Imād Shāhīs' (A. S. Bazmee Ansari), Suppl. 'Eliĉpur' (C. E. Bosworth).

H. K. Sherwani and P. M. Joshi (eds), *History of Medieval Deccan (1295-1724)*, I, 278-87, with a genealogical table at p. 278.

R. C. Majumdar (ed.), *The History and Culture of the Indian People. VII. The Mughul Empire*, ch. 14 IV.

173

THE QUTB SHĀHIS
901–1098/1496–1687
Golconda-Muhammadnagar

- 901/1496 Sultān Qulī Khawāṣṣ Khān Bahārū, Qutb al-Mulk
- o 950/1543 Yār Qulī Jamshīd b. Sultān Qulī
- o 957/1550 Ṣubhān b. Jamshīd
- o 957/1550 Ibrāhīm b. Sultān Qulī
- o 988/1580 Muḥammad Qulī b. Ibrāhīm
- o 1020/1612 Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Amīn b. Ibrāhīm
- o 1035/1626 ‘Abdallāh b. Muḥammad
- o 1083–98/1672–87 Abu ‘l-Hasan, son-in-law of ‘Abdallāh
- 1098/1687 *Mughal conquest*

The Qutb Shāhīs ruled over the east-central, largely Telugu-speaking part of the Deccan (now Andhra Pradesh State) from the ancient hill-fort of Golconda and then from their new city of Hyderabad (Haydarābād), which was adjacent to the fortress and planned by Muḥammad Qulī in 997/1589, and to which the state capital was moved some time afterwards.

The founder of the line, Sultān Qulī, was a Türkmen from western Persia who was descended from the Qara Qoyunlu (see above, no. 145) and who migrated to seek his fortune in South India soon after the fall of the Türkmen dynasty. He became one of Maḥmūd Shāh Bahmanī’s chief ministers and governor of Tilang Andhra or Telingana, the eastern part of the Bahmanid Sultanate and nucleus of the future Qutb Shāhī principality. His successors turned what had been *de facto* independence into the reality of sovereign power. Sultān Qulī Qutb Shāh had vigorously proclaimed his Twelver Shī’ism, eventually recognising the Ṣafawid Shāh Ismā‘īl I (see above, no. 148) as his spiritual suzerain, and the Qutb Shāhī court became a vigorous centre for Persian literature and culture in general. The Qutb Shāhīs were almost continuously involved in warfare with the other successor-states to the Bahmanids, the ‘Ādil Shāhīs and the Nizām Shāhīs (see above, nos 170, 171), and with Vijayanagar, until Shāh Jahān intervened in 1045/1636 and forced on the Qutb Shāhīs their recognition of Mughal suzerainty, in the shape of tribute and a treaty of submission (*inqiyād-nāma*) which, *inter alia*, banned the public celebration of Shī‘ī practices and festivals. Some fifty years later, Awrangzīb ended the Shāhs’ semi-independent status completely and incorporated their lands into his empire.

Justi, 471; Lane-Poole, 318, 321; Zambaur, 298–9.

^{EP} ‘Golkonḍā’ (H. K. Sherwani), ‘Haydarābād. a. City’ (J. Burton-Page), ‘Hind. IV. History’ (idem), ‘Qutb Shāhī’ (R. M. Eaton).

H. K. Sherwani and P. M. Joshi (eds), *History of Medieval Deccan (1295–1724)*, I, 411–90, with a genealogical table at p. 413, II, 446–7.

Haroon Khan Sherwani, *History of the Qutb Shāhī Dynasty*, New Delhi 1974, with a genealogical table at the end.

R. C. Majumdar (ed.), *The History and Culture of the Indian People. VII. The Mughul Empire*, ch. 14 IV.

THE ARGHŪNS
926–99/1520–91
Multan and Sind

1. The line of Dhu 'l-Nūn Beg

- c. 880/c. 1475 Dhu 'l-Nūn Beg Arghūn, governor of Kandahar and north-eastern Baluchistan for the Tīmūrids
 o (913/1507 Shāh Beg b. Dhi 'l-Nūn, governor in Kandahar for the Shībānids)
 926/1520 Shāh Beg, now as ruler in Upper Sind and then the whole province
 930–61/1524–54 Shāh Husayn b. Shāh Beg, d. 963/1556

2. The line of Muḥammad 'Īsā Tarkhān

- 961/1554 Muḥammad 'Īsā Tarkhān b. 'Abd al-'Alī, in Lower Sind (Maḥmūd Gokaltāsh, in Upper Sind until 982/1574)
 975/1567 Muḥammad Bāqī b. Muḥammad 'Īsā
 993–9/1585–91 Jānī Beg b. Muḥammad Bāqī, d. 1008/1599
 999/1591 *Mughal conquest of Lower Sind*

Sind and the Indus valley as far up as Multan had been invaded and settled by the Arabs at the beginning of the eighth century (see above, no. 160). But even after the Ghaznawids and Ghūrīds had extended over much of north-western India, Sind remained a comparatively isolated region, cut off from the major trends and events affecting Muslim India. In the eleventh century, Sind fell under the control of the Rājput tribe of the Sumerās. Their power was challenged in the early fourteenth century by the rival tribe of Sammās who, unlike the Sumerās, became firm Muslims and who emerged triumphant in the later part of the century. With the collapse of the Tughluqids (see above, no. 160, 3) and the shrinkage of the Delhi Sultans' authority, the ruling Jāms of the Sammās were able to dominate Sind from their capital Thāṭfā in Lower Sind until the early sixteenth century.

The Arghūns were a Turkish or Turco-Mongol tribe prominent under the Il Khānīds and then the Tīmūrīds. Dhu 'l-Nūn Beg Arghūn was appointed governor over what were later the eastern and southern parts of Afghanistan by the sultan in Herat, Husayn b. Maṣṣūr b. Bayqara (see above, no. 144, 2), and speedily became in effect independent there. The rise in the eastern Iranian world of powerful states like those of the Shībānīds and the Safawīds made the Arghūns' base of Kandahar increasingly untenable, so Shāh Beg and his son continued Dhu 'l-Nūn Beg's process of expansion southwards, conquering Multan and eventually defeating the last Sammā Jām and taking over the whole of Sind. After 961/1554, the Tarkhāns, a senior branch of the Arghūns, took over, but Akbar first annexed Upper Sind and then, finally, Lower Sind, so that Sind became incorporated into the province of Multan in the Mughal empire.

- ^{E12} 'Arghūn' (C. Collin Davies), 'Hind. IV. History' (J. Burton-Page), 'Sind. 1. History' (T. W. Haig and C. E. Bosworth).
- R. C. Majumdar et al. (eds), *The History and Culture of the Indian People*. VI. *The Delhi Sultanat*, ch. 10 F, G.
- M. Habib and K. A. Nizami (eds), *A Comprehensive History of India*. V. *The Delhi Sultanat (A.D. 1206–1526)*, ch. 18.

175

THE MUGHAL EMPERORS

932–1274/1526–1858

India

- 932/1526 Bābur b. 'Umar Shaykh, Muḥammad Zahir al-Dīn, ruler in Farghāna 899/1494
- (936–60/1530–53 Kāmran b. Bābur, in Kandahar, d. 964/1557)
- 937/1530 Humāyūn b. Bābur, Naṣir al-Dīn, first reign
- 947–62/1540–55 *Sūrī Sultans of Delhi*
- 962/1555 Humāyūn, second reign
- 963/1556 Akbar I b. Humāyūn, Abu 'l-Faṭḥ Muḥammad Jalāl al-Dīn
- 1014/1605 Jahāngīr b. Akbar, Abu 'l-Muzaḥḥar Muḥammad Sālim Nūr al-Dīn
- 1037/1627 Dāwar Bakhsh b. Khusraw b. Jahāngīr
- 1037/1628 Shāh Jahān I Khusraw b. Jahāngīr, Shihāb al-Dīn, d. 1076/1666
- (1068/1657 Murād Bakhsh b. Shāh Jahān, in Gujarāt, k. 1072/1661)
- (1068–9/1657–9 Sultān or Shāh Shujā' b. Shāh Jahān I, in Bengal, k. 1071/1660)
- (1068–9/1657–9 Dārā Shikūh b. Shāh Jahān I, in Agra, k. 1069/1659)
- 1068/1658 Awrangzīb b. Shāh Jahān I, Abu 'l-Muzaḥḥar Muḥammad 'Ālamgīr I Muḥyī 'l-Dīn
- (1118/1707 A'zam Shāh b. Awrangzīb, in northern India)
- (1118–20/1707–9 Kām Bakhsh b. Awrangzīb, in the Deccan)
- 1118/1707 Shāh 'Ālam I Bahādur b. Awrangzīb, Muḥammad Mu'azzam Qutb al-Dīn
- (1124/1712 'Azīm al-Sha'n Muḥammad 'Azīm b. Shāh 'Ālam I, claimant)
- 1124/1712 Jahāndār b. Shāh 'Ālam I, Abu 'l-Faṭḥ Mu'izz al-Dīn, k. 1125/1713
- 1124/1713 Farrukh-siyar b. Muḥammad 'Azīm
- 1131/1719 Rāfi' al-Darajāt b. Rāfi' al-Sha'n b. Shāh 'Ālam I, Shams al-Dīn
- 1131/1719 Shāh Jahān II b. Rāfi' al-Sha'n, Rāfi' al-Dawla
- 1131/1719 Nikū-siyar Muḥammad b. Muḥammad Akbar b. Awrangzīb
- (1132–3/1720 Ibrāhīm b. Rāfi' al-Sha'n)
- 1131/1719 Muḥammad Shāh b. Jahān Shāh b. Shāh 'Ālam I, Rawshan Akhtar Naṣir al-Dīn
- 1161/1748 Aḥmad Shāh Bahādur b. Muḥammad Shāh
- 1167/1754 'Ālamgīr II b. Jahāndār, 'Azīz al-Dīn
- (1173/1759 Shāh Jahān III b. Muḥammad b. Kām Bakhsh)
- 1173/1759 Shāh 'Ālam II b. 'Ālamgīr II, 'Alī Jawhar Jalāl al-Dīn, first reign

- o 1202/1788 Bīdār Bakht b. Aḥmad Shāh
- o 1203/1788 Shāh 'Ālam II, second reign
- o 1221/1806 Akbar II b. Shāh 'Ālam II, Abū Naṣr Muḥammad Mu'in al-Dīn
- o 1253-74/1837-58 Bahādur Shāh II b. Akbar II, Abu 'l-Muzaffar Muḥammad Sirāj al-Dīn, d. 1279/1862
- 1274/1858 *Mughal rule ended by the British*

Bābur, the founder of the Mughal dynasty, was a Chaghatay Turk of Central Asia, separated from Tīmūr by five generations on his father's side and from Chingiz Khān on his mother's. His father 'Umar Shaykh b. Abī Sa'id ruled a small Tīmūrid principality in the Central Asian region of Farghāna, but Bābur found that the rising power of the Shībānid Özbegs (see above, no. 151) made it difficult for him to retain a foothold there after his father's death. Accordingly, in 910/1514 he moved southwards and occupied Kabul, and very soon afterwards made his first raid into India as far as the Indus. It seems that Bābur only turned to India when his repeated attempts to regain power in his Central Asian homeland had failed, but eventually a discontented faction at the court of the Lōdī Sultans of Delhi (see above, no. 160, 5) invited him to intervene. He defeated Ibrāhīm II Lōdī at the first battle of Pānīpat in 932/1526 and, in the next year, a coalition of Rājput chiefs at Khānwa near Agra. Yet these victories were only a beginning. There was as yet no solid structure of Mughal power, and the strong reaction of the Afghan military leaders in India, led by Shīr Shāh Sūr (see above, no. 160, 6), caused Bābur's son Humāyūn to flee from northern India to Sind, Afghanistan and Persia for fifteen years. Only the weakness of Shīr Shāh's successors allowed Humāyūn to return in 962/1555 and establish himself in Delhi and Agra.

The fifty-year reign of Akbar the Great now followed. The Mughal hold on northern and central India was made firm: Mālwa and the independent Rājput states, Gujarāt and Khāndesh, were secured, and by 984/1576 Bengal was restored once more to the control of Delhi. The north-western frontier, gateway to India for so many invaders, was secured by the acquisition of Kabul and Kandahar, although the latter town was to be a bone of contention with the rulers of Persia for a long time to come. In the Deccan, the princedoms of the northern tier of the Bahmanid successor-states were either directly annexed or made to acknowledge Akbar's supremacy, but the military and administrative structures of the Empire were not yet strong enough for full authority to be established all through the Deccan; this was to be the work of Awrangzib, in whose reign almost all India – with the exceptions of the parts of western India controlled by the Marāṭhās and the southernmost tip of peninsular India – passed under Mughal control. On the diplomatic level, the initially friendly relations with the Ṣafawids were exchanged for an agreement with the Özbek 'Abdallāh Khan II (see above no. 153) over the demarcation of the respective territories of the Mughals and the Shībānids. There was also diplomatic contact with the Ottomans over the common threat to both empires from the Portuguese in the seas around Arabia and the Indian Ocean, but the distance between Delhi and Istanbul was too vast for a Sunnī Grand Alliance to emerge, and no concrete naval or military cooperation proved possible.

Akbar was thus undeniably a great general and statesman, but he is equally

interesting as a wide-ranging thinker on religious questions. His syncretistic *Dīn-i Ilāhī* or Divine Faith, though it was restricted in membership to an élite court circle, shows his deep intellectual curiosity about religions in general. Hindus participated to a greater extent than usual in the administration and direction of the empire. It was under Akbar that the governmental structure of the Mughal empire took shape, and he welded together into a governing class diverse ethnic elements, comprising Turks, Afghans, Persians and Hindus. This class formed the *mansabdārs*, holders of official appointments who were obliged to provide a certain number of troops. Official salaries were in part paid by *jāgīrs* or assignments of the revenues from estates, which were not, however, hereditary like the *iqṭā's* and *soyurghals* of the Islamic lands west of India. Although the ruler himself had theoretically unbridled secular authority, the early Mughals at least were benevolent rather than tyrannical despots; in any case, the very vastness of the empire made over-centralisation and the extension of the ruler's autocracy into every corner of it difficult to achieve.

Akbar's successors Jahāngīr and Shāh Jahān continued the policy of enforcing obedience over outlying parts – over the Rājput rulers of Mēwār, the Shī'ī sultanates of the Deccan, the Portuguese on the coasts of Bengal – but Shāh Jahān's ambitions of uniting Central Asia and India in a grand Sunnī empire only ended in failure and loss of prestige (1057/1647). When he abdicated in 1068/1657, a savage succession struggle broke out among his four sons. In the course of this, Awrangzīb twice defeated and then executed his brother Dārā Shikūh, and began a fifty-year reign. An orthodox reaction against the liberal and eclectic attitudes of Akbar and his son, spearheaded by the increasingly influential Naqshbandī Sūfī order, had been gathering momentum during the preceding decades. Awrangzīb now espoused in large measure this rigorist programme, attacking lax social and religious practices which had grown up in Muslim India under the all-pervading influence of the surrounding Hindu majority society and attempting a reformation along the lines to be enunciated in the eighteenth and early nineteenth century by such figures as Shāh Walī Allāh of Delhi and Sayyid Aḥmad of Bareilly and his *mujāhidīn*. In part, Awrangzīb's policy was a reaction against the renewed vigour, intellectual and material, of Hinduism; yet he continued to let Hindus form an integral part of the Mughal military and administrative structures. His military efforts were at first directed at strengthening the north-western frontier, where fierce fighting was necessary to exert control over the Pathan tribes. Latterly, he became increasingly concerned with the Deccan; the remaining Shī'ī sultanates, those of the 'Ādil Shāhīs and the Qutb Shāhīs, were extinguished, and the Marāṭhās curbed; yet this last check was only a temporary one, and the high point of Muslim power in the Deccan was never to be reached again.

Awangzīb's death in 1118/1707 began the agonising decline of the Mughals. A series of ephemeral rulers followed, and the longer reign of Muḥammad Shāh did not prevent the outlying provinces of the empire from falling into the hands of such groups as the Marāṭhās, the Jāfs, the Sikhs and the Rohilla Afghans. Nādir Shāh's invasion of India in 1151–2/1738–9 (see above, no. 149) and the sacking and occupation of Delhi, and the subsequent campaigns of Aḥmad Shāh Abdālī or Durrānī (see below, no. 180, 1), dealt the empire material and moral blows from which it never recovered. On several sides, Hindu fortunes were reviving, and the

factor of the British presence was now significant in the interior as well as in the coastlands. While the British were extending their power through Bengal to Oudh (see below, nos 176, 178), Central India and Rājputānā, the Mughals, whose practical authority reached little beyond Delhi, could only look on helplessly. Shāh 'Ālam II and his successors were British pensioners, and in 1274/1858 the last Mughal was deposed and exiled to Rangoon for complicity in the Sepoy Mutiny.

Justi, 472–5; Lane-Poole, 322–9; Zambaur, 300 and Table U.

*EP*² 'Mughals. 1. History, 11. Numismatics' (J. Burton-Page).

G. P. Taylor, 'Some dates relating to the Mughal Emperors of India', *JASB*, new series, 3 (1907), Numismatic Suppl., 57–64.

W. Irvine, *The Later Mughals*, I–II, Calcutta 1921–2, ed. and augmented Jadunath Sarkar, Allahabad 1974.

R. C. Majumdar (ed.), *The History and Culture of the Indian People*. VII. *The Mughul Empire*, chs 2–3, 5–8, 10.

idem (ed.), VIII. *The Maratha Supremacy*, Bombay 1977, ch. 5.

Ishwari Prasad, *India in the Eighteenth Century*, Allahabad 1973.

idem, *The Mughal Empire*, Allahabad 1974.

J. F. Richards, *The New Cambridge History of India*, I.5, *The Mughal Empire*, Cambridge 1993.

- 1116/1704 Murshid Qulī Khān, Ja'far Khān 'Alā' al-Dawla
 1138/1725 Shujā' Khān, Shujā' al-Dawla, Murshid Qulī Khān's son-in-law
 1151/1739 Sarfarāz Khān b. Shujā' al-Dawla, 'Alā' al-Dawla
 1153/1740 'Alīwirdī Khān, Mīrzā Muḥammad 'Alī Mahābat Jang Hāshim al-Dawla
 1169/1756 Mīrzā Maḥmūd b. Zayn al-Dīn Aḥmad, Sirāj al-Dawla, grandson of 'Alīwirdī Khān
 1170/1757 Mīr Ja'far Muḥammad Khān b. Sayyid Aḥmad Najafī, Hāshim al-Dawla, nephew by marriage of 'Alīwirdī Khān, first reign
 1174/1760 Mīr Qāsim 'Alī, son-in-law of Mīr Ja'far, d. 1191/1777
 1177-8/1763-5 Mīr Ja'far 'Alī, second reign
 1178/1765 *Incorporation of Bengal into British India; continuation of the line of Nawwābs in Murshidābād as local figures until the present day*

The Nawwāb-Nāzims of Bengal arose, like the Nizāms of Hyderabad (see below, no. 178) and the Nawwāb-Viziers of Oudh (see below, no. 177), out of the Mughal empire, and, until Britain formally took over Bengal (see below), ruled theoretically as governors for the Emperors in Delhi. Murshid Qulī Khān became *dīwān* or governor for Bengal under Awrangzīb, making his capital at Makḥṣūṣābād in West Bengal, which was now named after him Murshidābād; and his descendants, Shī'ī like himself, held on to the governorship of Bengal with the title Nawwāb. They managed to repel several Marāṭhā raids and incursions, but lost Orissa to them.

The middle years of the eighteenth century were, however, the time of transition from the East India Company's trading posts in Bengal to the acquisition of actual territory there. At the Battle of Plassey in 1170/1757, Clive defeated Sirāj al-Dawla and placed his own candidate, Mīr Ja'far, on the throne of Bengal. A final attempt by Mīr Qāsim and his allies, the Mughal Emperor Shāh 'Ālam II and the Nawwāb-Vizier of Oudh Shujā' al-Dawla, to overthrow British power failed at the Battle of Buxar (Baksar) in 1178/1764. After the battle, Shāh 'Ālam was compelled to make a formal grant of the revenues of Bengal, Bihar and Orissa to the British, and there was then constituted out of them a Presidency with supreme powers of superintendence over the other two Presidencies of British India, Bombay and Madras. Mīr Ja'far's son Mahābat Jang Najm al-Dawla and his descendants accordingly ruled only as petty local chiefs at Murshidābād in British Bengal. They became pensioners, first of the British Government of India, and then, after Partition, of the Government of the Indian Union.

Zambaur, 301.

Purna Ch. Majumdar, *The Musnud of Murshidabad (1704–1904). A Synopsis of the History of Murshidabad for the Last Two Centuries*, Murshidabad 1905, with a genealogical table at p. 13 and a list of the rulers, including the post-1178/1765 Nawwābs, 13–20.

R. C. Majumdar (ed.), *The History and Culture of the Indian People. VIII. The Maratha Supremacy*, ch. 10.

idem (ed.), *IX. British Paramountcy and Indian Renaissance*, Part I, Bombay 1963, ch. 4 E.6.

P. J. Marshall, *The New Cambridge History of India. II.2. Bengal, the British Bridgehead. Eastern India 1740–1828*, Cambridge 1987.

THE NAWWĀB-VIZIERS AND KINGS OF OUDH (AWADH)
1134–1272/1722–1856
North India

- 1134/1722 Sayyid Muḥammad Amīn Sa'adat Khān Bahādur, Burhān al-Mulk
1152/1739 Abū Mansūr Khān, Ṣafdar Jang
o 1167/1754 Haydar b. Ṣafdar Jang, Shujā' al-Dawla Jalāl al-Dīn
o 1189/1775 Aṣaf al-Dawla b. Haydar
1212/1797 Wazīr 'Alī, adopted son of Aṣaf al-Dawla, d. 1232/1817
o 1213/1798 Sa'adat 'Alī Khān b. Aṣaf al-Dawla
o 1229/1814 Haydar I b. Sa'adat 'Alī, Ghāzī 'l-Dīn, after 1234/1819
with the title of King
o 1243/1827 Haydar II Sulaymān Jāh b. Haydar I
o 1253/1837 Muḥammad 'Alī b. Sa'adat 'Alī, Mu'in al-Dīn
o 1258/1842 Amjad 'Alī Thurayyā Jāh b. Muḥammad 'Alī b. Sa'adat 'Alī
o 1263–72/1847–56 Wājid 'Alī b. Amjad, d. 1304/1887
1272/1856 *Annexation to British India*
o (1273/1857 Barjīs Qadīr b. Wājid 'Alī, raised to the throne during the Sepoy Mutiny)

The region of Oudh was part of the great Gangetic plain and comprised what is now the central region of Uttar Pradesh State, the Madhya Deśa or 'middle land' of Hindu epic times. In the Islamic period, its main cities were Lucknow (Lakhnaw) and Cawnpore (Kānpur).

The decline of the Mughal empire after Awrangzib's death in 1118/1707 allowed Sa'adat Khān, whose family stemmed from Khurasan in eastern Persia, and his successors as Nawwābs or governors, to assume virtual independence, although right to the end they acknowledged the theoretical suzerainty of the Mughal emperors in Delhi. During the eighteenth century, Oudh had a strategic importance in British eyes as a bulwark against Marāfihā encroachments from the west and south, and after 1178/1764 it was willy-nilly drawn into alliance with the East India Company in its base of Bengal. By the opening of the nineteenth century, however, Oudh was surrounded by British territory except for the frontier with Nepal on the north. The introduction of sound government was a proviso of the 1801 treaty with Oudh, and it was on grounds of misgovernment that the Governor-General Lord Dalhousie deposed Wājid 'Alī in 1272/1856, thus putting an end to the kingdom of Oudh. Fears aroused by its annexation turned out, in fact, to be a major contributory cause of the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857–8.

Under its local rulers, Oudh, and especially the capital Lucknow, with its court circle, witnessed a burgeoning of Shī'i religiosity, Urdu literature and Indo-Muslim architecture, and Lucknow remains today an important centre of North Indian Shī'ism.

Zambaur, 302.

^{El}2 'Awadh' (C. Collin Davies), 'Burhān al-Mulk' (A. S. Bazmee Ansari), 'Kānpur' (C. E. Bosworth), 'Lakhnaw' (Abdus Subhan).

G. P. Taylor, 'The coins of the Kings of Awadh', *JASB*, new series, 8 (1912), Numismatic Suppl., 249-74.

R. C. Majumdar (ed.), *The History and Culture of the Indian People*. VIII. *The Maratha Supremacy*, ch. 5 (b).

idem (ed.), IX. *British Paramountcy and Indian Renaissance*, Part I, ch. 4 C.

R. D. Barnett, *North India between Empires. Awadh, the Mughals and the British 1720-1801*, Berkeley CA 1980.

THE NIZĀMS OF HYDERABAD (HAYDARĀBĀD)
1137–1367/1724–1948
South India

- 1132/1720 Chin Qīlich Khān, Qamar al-Dīn Nizām al-Mulk,
Mughal governor of the Deccan, independent 1137/
1724 with the title Āṣaf Jāh
- 1161/1748 Nāṣir Jang b. Nizām al-Mulk
- 1164/1751 Muẓaffar Jang, Nizām al-Mulk's son-in-law
- 1165/1752 Ṣalābat Jang b. Nizām al-Mulk
- 1175/1762 Nizām 'Alī Khān b. Nizām al-Mulk
- 1218/1803 Sikandar Jāh b. Nizām 'Alī
- 1244/1829 Farkhanda 'Alī Khān b. Sikandar, Nāṣir al-Dawla
- 1273/1857 Mīr Maḥbūb 'Alī I b. Farkhanda 'Alī, Afdal al-Dawla
- 1285/1869 Mīr Maḥbūb 'Alī II b. Maḥbūb 'Alī I, until 1301/1884
under the regency of (Sir) Nawwāb Sālār Jang
- 1329–67/1911–48 Mīr 'Uthmān 'Alī Khān Bahādur Faṭḥ Jang b. Mīr
Maḥbūb 'Alī II
- 1367/1948 *Annexation by India*

By the end of the seventeenth century, the Mughals had absorbed all the lands of the former South Indian sultanates (see above, nos 164–8). The whole of the Muslim Deccan – excepting those parts of it conquered by the Marāṭhās – was now formed into a single vast province of the Deccan under a *ṣūbadār* or governor.

In the confusion and decay within the Mughal empire after Awrangzib's death in 1118/1707, Chin Qīlich Khān became governor of the Deccan in 1132/1720, and soon became independent at the former Qutb Shāhī capital of Hyderabad. The Mughal emperor Muḥammad Shāh granted him the further title of Āṣaf Jāh, henceforth borne by all the members of Chin Qīlich Khān's line, together with that of Nizām, derived from his honorific of Nizām al-Mulk. By the early nineteenth century, Hyderabad State was surrounded by British territory and had become an ally of Britain, although the Nizāms continued to acknowledge the puppet Mughal Emperors on their coins until the final demise of the latter. The theoretical suzerainty of the Mughals was nevertheless recognised until the final demise of the latter in 1274/1858 (see above, no. 175), and British sovereignty not explicitly acknowledged until 1926. At the time of the Partition of India in 1947, the Nizām's government opted for accession to Pakistan, but the state was forcibly integrated into the Indian Union in 1948 and the rule of the Nizāms ended.

Zambaur, 303.

ET² 'Haydarābād. b. Haydarābād State' (J. Burton-Page).

R. C. Majumdar (ed.), *The History and Culture of the Indian People. VIII. The Maratha Supremacy*, ch. 12.

179

THE MUSLIM RULERS IN MYSORE (MAHISUR, MAYSÜR)

1173–1213/1760–99

South India

o 1173/1760 Ḥaydar ‘Alī Khān Bahādur b. Faṭḥ Muḥammad, effective ruler in Mysore

o 1197–1213/1782–99 Tīpū Sultān b. Ḥaydar ‘Alī, sole ruler in Mysore after 1210/1796

1213/1799 *Restoration of the line of Hindu Rājās*

Mysore had been within the Hindu state of Vijayanagar, traditional foe of the Muslim sultanates of South India, in the extreme south of the Deccan, until the sultanates' victory over Vijayanagar in 972/1565 at Talikōṭa. Descendants of the Rājās of Vijayanagar established themselves in Mysore as the Rāma Rājā dynasty, managing to withstand the power of the ‘Ādil Shāhīs (see above, no. 170) and coming to a *modus vivendi* with the Mughal Awrangzib. In the mid-eighteenth century, their Muslim general Ḥaydar ‘Alī, who claimed noble Arab descent, achieved fame for repelling the Marāṭhās and then seized real power in the state, retaining the Rājās only as figureheads. His hostility to the British and to the Nizāms of Hyderabad drew him closer to the French, and this policy was continued by his son and successor Tīpū, who eventually dispensed with the Rājās, received French envoys at his capital Seringapatam and was admitted as ‘Citizen Tipu’ to membership of the French Republic. The forces of Britain and Hyderabad defeated Tīpū in 1213/1799, and he died in the fighting at Seringapatam. He had been a zealous enforcer of Islam on the Hindu majority of his subjects, including forcible conversions and circumcisions, and in the modern hagiography of Pakistan is revered as ‘the Martyr Sultan’. On his death, the old line of Hindu Rājās was restored in Mysore under British protection.

*EI*¹ ‘Tīpū Sultān’ (T. W. Haig), *EI*² ‘Ḥaydar ‘Alī Khān Bahādur’ (Mohibbul Hasan), ‘Mahisur, Maysūr. 1. Geography and history’ (C. E. Bosworth).

R. C. Majumdar (ed.), *The History and Culture of the Indian People. VIII. The Maratha Supremacy*, chs 12–13.

1. The Sadōzays or Popalzays

- 1160/1747 Aḥmad Khān Abdālī b. Muḥammad Zamān Khān, in Kandahar and Kabul
- 1184/1773 Tīmūr Shāh b. Aḥmad, in Herat, after 1189/1775 in Kabul
- 1207/1793 Zamān Shāh b. Tīmūr, in Kabul and Kandahar, after 1211/1797 in Herat
- 1215/1800 Maḥmūd Shāh b. Tīmūr, in Kabul and Kandahar, first reign
- (1218/1803 Qaysar b. Zamān Shāh, in Kabul and Kandahar)
- 1218/1803 Shāh Shujā' b. Tīmūr, Shujā' al-Mulk, in Kabul and Kandahar, first reign, after 1233/1818 a pensioner of Britain in India
- (1222–3/1807–8 Qaysar, in Kashmir)
 - 1224/1809 Maḥmūd Shāh, in Kabul and Kandahar, in Herat until 1245/1829, second reign
- 1233–41/1818–26 Period of civil war, with Bārakzay *Sardārs* in control and a series of puppet rulers in Kabul: 'Alī Shāh b. Tīmūr, ◦ Ayyūb Shāh b. Tīmūr, Ḥabīb Allāh b. 'Azīm Khān
- 1233–58/1818–42 Kāmran b. Maḥmūd Shāh, in Herat
 - (1241/1826 Dūst Muḥammad b. Pāyinda Khān Bārakzay, in Kabul, after 1250/1834 with the title of Amīr, first reign)
 - 1255/1839 Shāh Shujā', second reign, with British military support
 - 1258/1842 Fath Jang b. Shāh Shujā', in Kabul

2. The Bārakzays or Muḥammadzays

- 1259/1843 Dūst Muḥammad, in Kabul, in Kandahar 1272/1855 and in Herat 1279/1863
- 1279/1863 Shīr 'Alī b. Dūst Muḥammad, in Kabul, first reign
- 1283/1866 Muḥammad Afdal b. Dūst Muḥammad, in Kabul
- 1284/1867 Muḥammad A'zam b. Dūst Muḥammad, in Kabul
- 1285/1868 Shīr 'Alī, in Kabul, second reign, d. 1296/1879
- 1295–6/1878–9 Muḥammad Ya'qūb Khān b. Shīr 'Alī, regent for his father and then Amīr in Kabul after his death
- 1296–7/1879–80 *British occupation of eastern Afghanistan*
 - 1297/1880 'Abd al-Raḥmān b. Muḥammad Afdal
 - 1319/1901 Ḥabīb Allāh b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān
 - 1337/1919 Naṣr Allāh b. 'Abd al-Raḥmān, d. 1339/1921
 - 1337/1919 Amān Allāh b. Ḥabīb Allāh, d. 1379/1960
 - (1347/1929 *Bachcha-yi Saqqa(w)*, as Ḥabīb Allāh II, k. 1348/1929)
 - 1348/1929 Muḥammad Nādir b. Muḥammad Yūsuf b. Yahyā
- 1352–93/1933–73 Muḥammad Zāhir b. Nādir
 - 1393/1973 *Republican régime established*

The Ghilzay Afghans had played a leading part in Persian affairs during the declining years of the Ṣafawids, overrunning and occupying much of Persia during the third decade of the eighteenth century (see above, no. 148). Although Nādir Shāh ended this Afghan domination, he recruited large numbers of Afghans into his forces. One of his leading commanders was Aḥmad Khān of the Sadōzay section of the Abdālī tribe of Afghans, a tribe which was originally from the Herat region but which Nādir allowed to settle around Kandahar. After Nādir's assassination in 1160/1747, the Afghan troops acclaimed Aḥmad as their leader and as Shāh, and he assumed the title *Durr-i Durrān* 'Pearl of Pearls', whence the name Durrānī which then became applied to the Abdālīs in general and to the dynasty which he now proceeded to found in particular. It is roughly from this time, also, that, under the stimulus of Aḥmad's imperial ambitions and conquests, the name and the concept of 'Afghanistan' comes into existence and, for the first time, into literary and historical usage.

Aḥmad Shāh regarded himself as heir to Nādir's eastern conquests, and invaded India several times, clashing with the Mughals, the Marāthās and the Sikhs, and in 1170/1757 sacking Delhi and Agra. A great empire was built up in north-western India, including Sind, Baluchistan, much of the Panjab and Kashmīr, and his victory at the third battle of Pānīpat in 1174/1761 checked the ambitions of the Marāthās and, among other things, indirectly enabled the British to consolidate their power in India from their Bengal base. In Khurasan, Aḥmad established a protectorate over Nādir's descendant, the blind Shāh Rukh (see above, no. 149), although in the reign of Aḥmad's grandson Zamān Shāh the Afghans were powerless to stem the Qājār annexation of Khurasan and the deposition of Shāh Rukh. The last years of the eighteenth century and the early decades of the nineteenth were, indeed, disastrous for the Durrānī empire. The family was rent by internal feuds, with members of it at odds with each other from bases in the three key cities of the land, Kabul, Kandahar and Herat, and the Marāthās and Sikhs were able to eject the Afghans from most of their Indian possessions.

Meanwhile, the star of another branch of the Abdālīs, the Bārakzays or Muḥammadzays, was already rising. In 1233/1818, Dūst Muḥammad controlled Kabul, where he set up a puppet Sadōzay ruler, himself assuming the title of Amīr of Kabul some sixteen years later. With the loss of the Indian possessions, the Afghan kingdom was now a geographically compact unit, essentially one of mountains and plateaux, prolonged occupation of which by outside powers was extremely difficult to achieve, as British expeditions were to find during the course of the nineteenth century. Hence Afghanistan survived intact into the twentieth century, fighting off Persian ambitions regarding Herat, pressure from Imperial Russia in the north and two wars with Britain. Dūst Muḥammad resisted temptations to intervene in India, and remained indifferent to the rebels' cause during the Indian Sepoy Mutiny. After the Second Afghan-British War, 'Abd al-Raḥmān Khān established careful and correct relations with the Great Powers, and this policy was only broken by the impetuosity of Amān Allāh in 1337/1919, provoking the Third Afghan-British War. His later, over-hasty attempts at the modernisation of a profoundly conservative and traditionalist Islamic society led to his abdication. The throne passed to another branch of the family, which retained power until monarchical rule was replaced in 1393/1973

by a republican régime under the last king's cousin Muḥammad Dāwūd b. Muḥammad 'Azīz b. Muḥammad Yūsuf, the prelude to a Communist takeover of the country and its being plunged into a period of bloody warfare which still continues today.

Lane-Poole, 330-5; Zambaur, 304-5.

*EP*² 'Afghānistān. V. History' (M. Longworth Dames).

M. Longworth Dames, 'The coins of the Durrānis', *NC*, 3rd series, 8 (1888), 325-63.

L. White King, 'History and coinage of the Bārakzai dynasty of Afghānistān', *NC*, 3rd series, 16 (1896), 276-344.

W. K. Fraser-Tytler, *Afghanistan. A Study of Political Developments in Central and Southern Asia*, 3rd edn, London 1967, with a genealogical table of the Bārakzays on p. 346.

Louis Dupree, *Afghanistan*, Princeton 1973, Parts III-IV.

Vartan Gregorian, *The Emergence of Modern Afghanistan. Politics of Reform and Modernization, 1880-1946*, Stanford CA 1969.

SEVENTEEN

South-East Asia and Indonesia

181

THE RULERS OF MALACCA (MELAKA)
c. 805–1111/c. 1403–1699

The south-western coast of the Malay peninsula

- by 805/1403 Parameśvara
- 817/1414 Megat Iskandar Shāh b. Parameśvara
- 827/1424 Śri Maharājā Sultan Muḥammad Shāh, son of Megat Iskandar Shāh
- ? 849/1445 Rājā Ibrāhīm, Śri Parameśvara Deva Shāh, son of Muḥammad Shāh
- o 850/1446 Rājā Qāsim, Sultan Muẓaffar Shāh, son of Muḥammad Shāh
- 863/1459 Rājā ‘Abdallāh, Sultan Manṣūr Shāh, son of Muẓaffar Shāh
- 882/1477 Sultan ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Ri‘āyat, Manṣūr Shāh
- o 893–934/1488–1528 Sultan Maḥmūd Shāh b. Ri‘āyat Shāh, first reign
- o 916/1510 Sultan Aḥmad Shāh b. Maḥmūd Shāh
- 916–34/1510–28 Sultan Maḥmūd Shāh, second reign
- (917/1511 *Portuguese conquest of Malacca*)
- Continuance of members of the Malaccan dynasty in the Riau-Lingga archipelago and in peninsular Malaysia, for example
- 934/1528 Sultan ‘Alā’ al-Dīn b. Maḥmūd Shāh, in Johor
- 934/1528 Sultan Muẓaffar Shāh b. Maḥmūd Shāh, in Perak

The origins of the kingdom of Malacca are obscure; it has been suggested that it was in existence well before the fifteenth century, but the majority view is that it was founded by Parameśvara (literally, ‘prince-consort’, i.e. he was the husband of a princess of the Hindu kingdom of Majapahit in Java) at the opening of the fifteenth century. It grew rapidly in importance as a trading centre and as a nest of corsairs, and from the ability of its rulers to levy transit dues on shipping through the Straits of Malacca. Parameśvara seems to have become a Muslim through a further marriage to a daughter of the Sultan of Pasè or Pasai in the northern tip of Sumatra, Muslim since the fourteenth century. The names of the subsequent rulers of Parameśvara’s line and their regnal dates are known partly from written sources and partly from their gravestones, but the dates in several cases must be regarded as only approximate. In the mid-fifteenth century, the rulers followed a lively expansionist policy, warding off Siamese attacks, extending their power within peninsular Malaya and across the Straits to Sumatra, and entertaining diplomatic relations with the Ming Emperors of China. At this time,

Malacca became not only the chief trading-centre for South-East Asia but also the main diffusion-centre there for the Islamic faith. Thus local rulers within the Malay peninsula became vassals of Malacca and Muslims at the same time, while Brunei, in northern Borneo (see below, no. 186), came to accept the faith through its trading connections with Malacca, as did various ports along the north coast of Java.

The end of the line of Paramesvara came from the attacks of the Portuguese under Afonso de Albuquerque, so that Malacca passed into Portuguese hands in 917/1511 and became a centre for Portuguese trade in East Asia. But scions of the native Malayan dynasty continued in the islands to the south of Malaya, the kingdom of Riau-Lingga (whose last sultan reigned until as recently as 1911; now within Indonesia), and still survive on the Malayan mainland in the present-day sultanates of Johor, Pahang and Trengganu.

*El*² 'Malacca' (Barbara Watson Andaya).

D. G. E. Hall, *A History of South-East Asia*, 4th edn, London 1981, 221ff., 366ff., with a genealogical table at p. 973.

Saran Singh, *The Encyclopaedia of the Coins of Malaysia, Singapore and Brunei 1400-1986*, Kuala Lumpur 1986.

THE SULTANS OF ACHEH (ATJÈH, ACEH)

c. 901–1321/c. 1496–1903

The northern tip of Sumatra

- c. 854/c. 1450 'Ināyat Shāh
 - ? Muẓaffar Shāh, d. 902/1497
 - ? Shams al-Dīn Shāh
- c. 901/c. 1496 'Alī Mughāyat Shāh
- o c. 936/c. 1530 Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn b. 'Alī
- o c. 944/c. 1537 Ri'āyat Shāh b. 'Alī, 'Alā' al-Dīn al-Qaḥḥār
 - o 979/1571 'Alī or Ḥusayn Ri'āyat Shāh
 - 987/1579 Sultan Muda
 - 987/1579 Sultan Sri 'Ālam
 - 987/1579 Zayn al-'Ābidīn
 - o 987/1579 Mansūr Shāh, 'Alā' al-Dīn, originally of Perak, son-in-law of 'Alā' al-Dīn Ri'āyat Shāh
- o c. 994/c. 1586 'Alī Ri'āyat Shāh or Rājā Buyung
- o c. 996/c. 1588 Ri'āyat Shāh, 'Alā' al-Dīn
 - 1013/1604 'Alī Ri'āyat Shāh or Sultan Muda
 - o 1016/1607 Iskandar Muda, posthumously called Makota 'Ālam 'Crown of the World'
 - o 1046/1636 Mughāyat Shāh, Iskandar Thānī 'Alā' al-Dīn
 - o 1051/1641 Ṣafiyyat al-Dīn Shāh bt. Iskandar Muda, Taj al-'Ālam, queen, widow of Iskandar Thānī
 - 1086/1675 Naqiyyat al-Dīn Shāh, Nūr al-'Ālam, queen
 - o 1089/1678 Zakiyyat al-Dīn Shāh, 'Ināyat, queen
 - o 1099/1688 Zīnat al-Dīn Kamālat Shāh, queen
 - 1111/1699 Sharīf Ḥāshim Jamāl al-Dīn Badr al-'Ālam
 - o 1114/1702 Perkasa 'Ālam Sharīf Lamtuy b. Sharīf Ibrāhīm
 - 1115/1703 Badr al-Munīr, Jamāl al-'Ālam
 - 1138/1726 Amīn al-Dīn Shāh, Jawhar al-'Ālam
 - 1138/1726 Shams al-'Ālam or Wandī Tēbing
 - 1139/1727 Aḥmad Shāh or Maharājā Lela Mēlayu, 'Alā' al-Dīn
 - o 1148/1735 Jahān Shāh or Pōtjut Auk, 'Alā' al-Dīn
- 1173–95/1760–81 Maḥmūd Shāh or Tuanku Raja
 - (1177–8/1764–5 Badr al-Dīn
 - 1187/1773 Sulaymān Shāh or Raja Udahna Lela)
 - 1195/1781 Muḥammad Shāh or Tuanku Muḥammad, 'Alā' al-Dīn
- 1209–39/1795–1824 Jawhar al-'Ālam Shāh, 'Alā' al-Dīn
 - (1230–5/1815–20 Sharīf Sayf al-'Ālam)
 - 1239/1824 Muḥammad Shāh b. Jawhar al-'Ālam Shāh
 - o 1252/1836 Mansūr Shāh
 - 1287/1870 Maḥmūd Shāh
 - 1291/1874 *Capture of the capital Kutaraja by the Dutch*
- 1291–1321/1874–1903 Muḥammad Dāwūd Shāh, 'Alā' al-Dīn
 - 1321/1903 *Definitive Dutch conquest of Aceh*

Acheh is the most northerly part of Sumatra, and it became the centre of a powerful Muslim sultanate which at times controlled much also of the coastlands of Sumatra to the south. Sustained Islamic activity in the region, brought from western India, certainly dates from the thirteenth century. Marco Polo found a Muslim town Ferlec (Pĕrlak) on the north-eastern coast of Sumatra and along the Malaccan Straits; Ibn Battūta landed at Muslim ports there some forty years later, and the names of various Muslim rulers, for some of whom there are coins extant, are known from c. 1300.

When the sultanate of Acheh was established in the early sixteenth century, it rapidly gained control of much trade with Gujarāt and with China, and in this expansionist phase confronted the Portuguese in Malacca and such Malayan states as Johor and Pĕrlak, with its sultans soliciting and receiving aid from the Ottoman Turks. A three-cornered struggle ensued between the Portuguese, Acheh and Johor, complicated in the seventeenth century by the appearance of the Dutch and English. By then, the sultans of Acheh were dealing substantially with the Dutch over the export trade in tin from Pĕrak, but in the later seventeenth century Acheh declined in power under the nominal rule of a series of female rulers, with the real authority exercised by the great chiefs. Acheh nevertheless remained a strong religious and cultural centre for Indonesian Islam, with such famous scholars as Hamza Faṣṣūrī (flor. in the later sixteenth century) as proponents of an Indian-type Ṣūfī mysticism in Indonesia.

In the nineteenth century, tensions became acute with the Dutch government, by now controlling southern and central Sumatra, largely because of Achenese piracy and slave trading in the waters around northern Sumatra. These led to a lengthy and costly guerilla war extending from 1873 to 1903, by the end of which the Acheh sultanate was swept away and the last claimant to its throne exiled; members of the family still survive, however, in contemporary Indonesia.

Zambaur, 308.

ET² 'Atjĕh' (Th. W. Juynboll and P. Voorhoeve).

Jan M. Pluvier, *A Handbook and Chart of South-East Asian History*, Kuala Lumpur 1967, 25–7 (recent period only).

T. Ibrahim Alfian, *Mata uang emas kerajaan-kerajaan di Aceh*, Aceh Museum, Aceh 1977.

D. G. E. Hall, *A History of South-East Asia*, 4th edn, 367–72, 618–22, with a genealogical table at pp. 973–4.

M. C. Ricklefs, *A History of Modern Indonesia since c. 1300*, 2nd edn, London 1993, 32–6, 133–8.

183

THE RULERS OF MATARAM c. 983–1168/c. 1575–1755 *Central Java*

- c. 983/c. 1575 Mas Ngabehi Sutavijaya Senapati, son of Kjai Gede Pamanahan
- 1009/1601 Panembahan Seda Krapyak, Mas Jolang
- 1022/1613 Tjakrakusuma Ngabdurrahman, Sultan Agung, after 1034/1625 with the title *Susuhunan*
- 1055/1645 Prabu Amangkurat I, Sunan Tegalwangi
- 1088/1677 Amangkurat II
- 1115/1703 Amangkurat III, Sunan Mas
- 1117/1705 Pakubuwana I, Sunan Puger
- 1131/1719 Amangkurat IV, Jawa
- 1137/1725 Pakubuwana II, Kombul
- 1162–8/1749–55 Pakubuwana III, Swarga
- 1168/1755 *Division of the kingdom into the states of Surakarta and Jogjakarta (Yogyakarta)*

Mataram was the third Muslim sultanate to arise in Java after those of Demak in north-central Java (917–57/1511–50) and Bantam at the extreme western end of the island (932–1228/1526–1813). It was centred on what is now Surakarta, and was founded by the father of Senapati (literally, ‘commander’, i.e. of his original overlord the Sultan of Pajang), around whose origins a cloud of legend grew up in an attempt to connect him, probably speciously, with earlier royal families such as those of Majapahit. With his grandson Sultan Agung, the dynasty produced one of Indonesia’s greatest rulers, who captured the rival city of Surabaya and extended his power as far as the island of Madura and Borneo; in 1625 he assumed the title *Susuhunan* (literally, ‘royal foot’, i.e. placed on the head of a vassal paying homage, not very felicitously rendered by the Dutch as ‘emperor’, since the term has more a religious connotation, being associated with the legendary *walis* or saints who are said first to have brought Islam to Java).

The Dutch in Batavia were in fact becoming a power in Java, and were opposed to Agung’s strongly Islamic policies of forging closer links with Arabia and of reviving the former Javanese empire of Majapahit. Agung’s weaker successors eventually came to terms with the Dutch, and a treaty of 1684 made the sultanate practically a dependency of the Dutch East India Company (VOC), which now controlled a block of territory in western Java cutting the island into two parts. In the early eighteenth century, the Dutch were called into the internal quarrels of Mataram, the so-called First and Second Javanese Wars of Succession (1116–17/1704–5 and 1133–4/1721–2), and further disputes led to a partition of Mataram between rival claimants in 1168/1755, with two subsequent sultanates at Surakarta and Jogjakarta (see below, nos 184, 185).

^{Et} ‘Java’ (A. W. Nieuwenhuis), ‘Surakarta’ (C. C. Berg).

D. G. E. Hall, *A History of South-East Asia*, 4th edn, 303–8, 337–8, 341–2, 346–54, 359–60, with a genealogical table at p. 972.

M. C. Ricklefs, *A History of Modern Indonesia since c. 1300*, 2nd edn, 39–48, 69–93.

184

THE SUSUHUNANS OF SURAKARTA

1168–1368/1755–1949

Central Java

- 1168/1755 Pakubuwana III, Swarga, of Mataram
- 1202/1788 Pakubuwana IV, Bagus
- 1235/1820 Pakubuwana V, Sugih
- 1238/1823 Pakubuwana VI, Bangun Tapa
- 1245/1830 Pakubuwana VII, Purbaya
- 1274/1858 Pakubuwana VIII, Angabehi
- 1277/1861 Pakubuwana IX, Bangun Kadaton
- 1310/1893 Pakubuwana X, Wicaksana
- 1358/1939 Pakubuwana XI
- 1363–/1944– Pakubuwana XII
- (1368/1949 *Republic of Indonesia proclaimed*)

In the course of the Third Javanese War of Succession (1162–70/1749–57), a partition of the Mataram territories was made in 1168/1755. Pakubuwana III continued as ruler of the eastern half of the kingdom, with Surakarta as his capital and with himself and his descendants bearing the title of *Susuhunan*, one higher than that of Sultan. A portion of Mataram, Mangku-Negara, went to a third claimant, Mas Said, now styled Mangkunegara, the nephew of Pakubuwana II and his brother, Mangkubumi, this last now sultan in Jogjakarta. These were in effect vassal states of the VOC and then of the Dutch government, but the two rival states of Surakarta and Jogjakarta had to work out a system of living in harmony and administering the divided lands within a Javanese political tradition which had known only a sole ruler. Once this understanding was achieved, both states survived the nineteenth century, with its bursts of violence such as the Javanese War of 1825–30, into the twentieth century, through the Japanese occupation of 1942–5 and into the constituting of the Indonesian Republic after the Second World War. The long-reigning Susuhunan Pakubuwana XII still retains his social position at Surakarta within contemporary Indonesia.

*Et*² 'Surakarta' (O. Schumann).

Jan M. Pluvier, *A Handbook and Chart of South-East Asian History*, 29, 31.

D. G. E. Hall, *A History of South-East Asia*, 4th edn, 359–60, 502ff., with a genealogical table at pp. 972–3.

M. C. Ricklefs, *A History of Modern Indonesia since c. 1300*, 2nd edn, 94–103, 110–11.

185

THE SULTANS OF JOGJAKARTA 1168–1368/1755–1949 *South-central Java*

- 1168/1755 Abdurrahman Mangkubuwana or Hämengkubuwana I,
Swarga
- 1206/1792 Abdurrahman Mangkubuwana or Hämengkubuwana II,
Sepuh, first reign
- 1225/1810 Abdurrahman Mangkubuwana or Hämengkubuwana III,
Rājā, first reign
- 1226/1811 Abdurrahman Mangkubuwana or Hämengkubuwana II,
Sepuh, second reign
- 1227/1812 Abdurrahman Mangkubuwana or Hämengkubuwana III,
Rājā, second reign
- 1229/1814 Abdurrahman Mangkubuwana or Hämengkubuwana
IV, Seda Pesiyar
- 1237/1822 Abdurrahman Mangkubuwana or Hämengkubuwana V,
Menol, first reign
- 1241/1826 Abdurrahman Mangkubuwana or Hämengkubuwana II,
Sepuh, third reign
- 1243/1828 Abdurrahman Mangkubuwana V, Menol, second reign
- 1271/1855 Abdurrahman Mangkubuwana or Hämengkubuwana
VI, Mangkubumi
- 1294/1877 Abdurrahman Mangkubuwana or Hämengkubuwana
VII, Angabehi
- 1339/1921 Abdurrahman Mangkubuwana or Hämengkubuwana
VIII
- 1358–1408/1939–88 Abdurrahman Mangkubuwana or Hämengkubuwana IX
1368/1949 *Republic of Indonesia proclaimed*
- 1408–/1988– Abdurrahman Mangkubuwana or Hämengkubuwana X

The sultanate of Jogjakarta arose out of the partition of Mataram in 1168/1755 (see above, nos 183, 184). Relations with the sister state of Surakarta were at times strained, with the respective rulers endeavouring on occasion to use the Dutch and, in the early nineteenth century, the British, as their allies. Leadership in the Javanese War of 1825–30 came from a prince of the royal house of Jogjakarta, Dipanagara, who himself claimed the title of sultan and protector of Islam. Like its sister state, the sultanate of Jogjakarta has endured until the present day and the constituting of the Republic of Indonesia. Sultan Mangkubuwana IX played a role in resistance to the Dutch attempts at reimposing their colonial rule after the Second World War and was a member of the first Indonesian cabinet after independence; his son Mangkubuwana X has succeeded him, retaining his social position in Jogjakarta at the present time.

^{ET} 'Djokyakarta' (A. W. Nieuwenhuis).

Jan M. Pluvier, *A Handbook and Chart of South-East Asian History*, 29, 31.

D. G. E. Hall, *A History of South-East Asia*, 4th edn, 502ff., with a genealogical table at p. 973.

M. C. Ricklefs, *A History of Modern Indonesia since c. 1300*, 2nd edn, 95–104, 109–18.

186

THE SULTANS OF BRUNEI ? seventh century AD onwards *Northern Borneo*

- early tenth century/
- early sixteenth century Muhammad, of the Bendahara family, became a Muslim in 920/1514
 - c. 927/c. 1521 Ahmad, brother of Muhammad
 - c. 932/c. 1526 Sharif Ali, Sultan Berkat, son-in-law of Ahmad
 - ? Sulaiman b. Sharif Ali
 - ? Bolkiah b. Sulaiman
 - ? Abdul Kahhar b. Bolkiah, d. 986/1578
 - ruling in 986/1578 Saiful Rijal b. Abdul Kahhar, d. c. 998/c. 1590
 - c. 998/c. 1590 Shah Brunei b. Saiful Rijal
 - c. 1008/c. 1600 Raja Chafur b. Shah Brunei, under the regency of his uncle Muhammad Hasan
 - 1009/1601 Muhammad Hasan b. Saiful Rijal
 - 1026/1617 Abdul Jalilul Akbar b. Muhammad Hasan, posthumously called Marhum Tuha
 - c. 1047/c. 1637 Abdul Jalilul Jabbar b. Abdul Jalilul Akbar
 - c. 1052/c. 1642 Haji Muhammad Ali b. Muhammad Hasan
 - c. 1058/c. 1648 Abdul Hakk Mubin, grandson of Saiful Rijal
 - 1065/1655 Muhyiddin, probably first acclaimed sultan in 1058/1648, d. c. 1081/c. 1670
 - o decade 1081–91/
 - 1670–80 Nasruddin Husin Kamaluddin
 - o c. 1091/c. 1680 Muhammad Aliuddin, son-in-law of Husin Kamaluddin
- 1101 to mid-twelfth century/ *Period of usurpation and civil warfare,*
- 1690-mid-eighteenth century *followed by the restoration of the Bendaharas:*
 - c. 1163/c. 1750 Omar Ali Saifuddin I, d. 1209/1795
 - 1194/1780 Muhammad Tajuddin b. Omar Ali Saifuddin I, first reign
 - 1206/1792 Muhammad Jamalul Alam b. Muhammad Tajuddin
 - 1207/1793 Muhammad Tajuddin. second reign
 - 1221/1806 Muhammad Kanzul Alam b. Omar Ali Saifuddin I
 - c. 1237/c. 1822 Raja Api b. Muhammad Kanzul Alam
 - c. 1237/c. 1822 Omar Ali Saifuddin II, nephew of Raja Api
 - o 1268/1852 Abdul Mumin
 - o 1302–24/1885–1906 Hashim b. Omar Ali Saifuddin II
 - 1324/1906 *British Residency established*
 - 1324/1906 Muhammad Jamalul Alam b. Omar Ali Saifuddin II
 - 1342/1924 Ahmad Tajuddin b. Muhammad Jamalul Alam
 - 1369/1950 Daughter of Ahmad Tajuddin

o 1369/1950 Sir Omar Ali Saifuddin III b. Muhammad Jamalul Alam

o 1387-/1967- Sir Hassanal Bolkiah b. Omar Ali Saifuddin

Brunei, on the north coast of Borneo, is an old-established sultanate which has survived until today as the State of Brunei. It has been surmised that emigrants from the South-East Asian mainland may have founded Brunei as far back as the seventh century AD, and there are sporadic mentions of it in Chinese sources of the next few centuries, since there were clearly trade contacts with China. Official Brunei wisdom today holds that the Brunei sultanate has been perpetually Muslim, and official genealogies and lore place the first Muslim rulers in the fourteenth or early fifteenth century. In fact, while Islam was doubtless established along the north Borneo littoral from an early time as a result of commercial contacts with Malaysia, Sumatra, etc., there is evidence that the sultans may not have been converted from the indigenous paganism until the early sixteenth century. The chronology for the Muslim rulers followed in the table above is essentially that of Robert Nicholl, what might be called a 'shorter' chronology; but, as noted above, official Bruneian historiography favours a 'longer' chronology going back 100 or 150 years earlier. It is nevertheless the case that only in the eighteenth century does the chronology becomes more or less certain.

The first Muslim sultans made Brunei the centre of a considerable empire, embracing most of Borneo itself, Celebes (modern Sulawesi) and the Sulu archipelago and even the southern Philippines. It was this empire which was first encountered by Spanish and Portuguese voyagers in South-East Asian waters; their reports and narratives, from those of Magellan's expedition onwards, are a prime source for the history and chronology of the Brunei sultanate against which the indigenous tradition can be tested. The sultanate was torn by internal strife thereafter and became constricted by European pressures, with its authority confined now to northern Borneo. In 1841, much of this last had to be ceded to Sir James Brooke as Rajah of Sarawak, and in 1877 Brunei's portion of north-eastern Borneo was leased to British trading interests, eventually to the British North Borneo Company, reducing the sultanate to its present size. In 1888, Brunei became a British protectorate, and from 1906 a British Resident was installed. The exploitation of large reserves of oil and natural gas has revived the fortunes of Brunei in the twentieth century. It decided in 1973 not to join the Malaysian Federation; the sultanate became a constitutional monarchy under British protection, but since 1984 has been a fully-independent state known officially as Negara Brunei Darussalam.

The coins of the Sultans of Brunei are (like those of many other Indonesian dynasties) difficult to utilise as historical evidence, since dates are frequently not given on the coins, and titles of rulers are often recorded in an abbreviated or cursory manner, hence applicable to more than one ruler.

*EI*² Suppl. 'Brunei' (O. Schumann).

D. E. Brown, *Brunei: The Structure and History of a Bornean Malay Sultanate*, Monograph of the Brunei Museum Journal, no. II/2, Brunei 1970, 130-63.

Saran Singh, 'The coinage of the Sultanate of Brunei, 1400-1980', *Brunei Museum Journal*, 4:4 (1980), 38-103, with a genealogical table at p. 45.

idem, *The Encyclopaedia of the Coins of Malaysia, Singapore and Brunei 1400–1986*.

Sylvia C. Engelen Krausse and Gerald H. Krausse, *Brunei*, World Bibliographical Series no. 93, Oxford 1988, Introd., with a genealogical table at pp. xlii–xliii.

Robert Nicholl, 'Some problems of Brunei chronology', *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 20 (Singapore 1989), 175–95.